ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/16/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED000038

2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7376

3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Allison, James B. et al.

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Report on College of Arts and Sciences Self Study, Rutgers University

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

TYPE OF REPORT
- PROPOSAL ☐
- IN-PROGRESS ☐
- FINAL ☒
- FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Rutgers, the State University
ST. New Brunswick,
CITY, STATE New Jersey
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Rutgers, The State University

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	53	54

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR self-study

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

		foreign langs.	liberal arts	
articulation'	reading	required courses		
counseling	writing	programs		
teaching meths.	speech	curriculum		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The results of a comprehensive self-study of the College of Arts and Science conducted by a special Curriculum Committee at Rutgers University. Deals with relations with secondary schools; academic advising; teaching; reading, writing, and speaking; foreign language requirements; area programs; and philosophy of education. Presents general curriculum recommendations.

ERIC No. | 18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

5-4 R.

#7376

7/24 #7376 1953

tribution

REPORT ON COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES SELF STUDY

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

HE7376

Submitted to the faculty by the
Curriculum Committee.

James B. Allison
Monroe Berkowitz
James W. Green
Ira M. Freeman
Donald J. McGinn
C. Russell Phelps
Clarence E. Turner
Henry R. Winkler

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED000038

INTRODUCTION

On January 16, 1952, Dean Harry G. Owen appointed a special committee of eight professors to study the curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences and to make recommendations to the faculty concerning changes. During the spring of 1952 the Curriculum Committee held numerous meetings. Its efficiency was circumscribed by the fact that all of its members were carrying on full programs of teaching, research and other committee duties in addition to their analysis of the curriculum. It was impossible to study at first hand other institutions in order to make a comparative evaluation of problems in general education. It was possible only to a limited degree to exchange ideas by correspondence with colleagues in other universities attempting similar examinations. There was little opportunity to observe programs at institutions where noteworthy experiments in general education have been conducted.

Within these limits, the Committee made a tentative start on what will obviously be a long-term assessment of education in the College of Arts and Sciences. It was guided by the conviction that the primary duties of the College were to help the undergraduate understand his cultural heritage - defined in the broadest sense - and to prepare him for effective participation in the continuing development of Western culture. Some of its members came to the conclusion that premature specialization was a deterrent to the fullest realization of the wholly-educated man. Others felt that it might be wiser to pursue from the beginning a parallel course of thorough specialization and broad - but equally thorough - exposure to the realm of moral values, aesthetic judgments, social problems. All were agreed that not only skill, but more importantly, understanding, were the goals of our undergraduate education. Its purpose must be, they felt, to help the student learn to ask better and better questions - and to be satisfied only with better and better answers. This meant an emphasis on method, on independent critical thinking, and on a curriculum which would best liberate both faculty and students to pursue such purposes.

All of this implied, in the view of the Committee, that the collegiate program must have the double aim of securing for the undergraduate both depth and breadth of intellectual experience. While it was recognized that a faculty which considers its curriculum to be perfect, has in effect ceased to fulfill its function, it was felt that on the whole the first of these aims, that of depth, was already relatively effectively achieved by the several departments in their respective major curricula. On the other hand, it was suggested that certain improvements ought to be attempted in the methods of achieving the second, that of breadth. The present general education requirements, it was argued, tend to leave the student with a heterogeneous assortment of data outside his field of specialization which he rarely integrates or views in their possible inter-relation. On May 7, 1952, the Committee submitted for discussion by the Advisory Committee of department chairmen a sample curriculum which embodied some of the goals described above. Certain - and it should be said desirable - differences of opinion were revealed in the discussions with the departmental chairmen, and the Committee felt that by raising questions it had precipitated a lively discussion among faculty members on the whole problem of the curriculum.

It was apparent, however, that the nature of desirable improvements had to be studied in the light of the complicated pattern of education undertaken by Rutgers as a state university. The undergraduates of the College of Arts and Sciences and coordinate branches of the University come from an extremely heterogeneous cross-section of the populations of New Jersey and surrounding states. They come from a wide range of income groups, ethnic backgrounds, and previous experience with intellectual life. Many are almost exclusively vocationally-minded. The necessity of providing service courses for a wide variety of programs - in agriculture, engineering, nursing, education, and the like - further complicates the problem.

In order that the whole pattern of education in the College of Arts and Sciences be more thoroughly canvassed, it was felt desirable that more time be made available for Committee members, working closely with administrative officers and their faculty colleagues, to examine the problem. The Committee required the freedom to investigate the various implications of the College's situation, to study nearby institutions or others where outstanding experiments in basic education have been attempted. Questions of educational policy, it was felt, should be explored at some length and without undue pressure of time. Should the College advocate a more unified core of prescribed work in general education for students in the professional and technical schools? Should the present experimental courses be augmented by similar ventures in other fields, or are there more effective curricular arrangements that might be attempted? In what way might the College benefit from the preceptorial system for underclassmen, and how would it be possible to achieve the resulting lower teacher-faculty ratios? And as an overall question, have we adequately stated and thought through our overall educational purpose? These were questions which merited more than a mere incidental consideration as an "extra chore" in an already overcrowded schedule. Accordingly, the Dean of the College, with the help of the Committee, drafted an application to the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation for funds to make this study. The application was successful, and the College of Arts and Sciences became one of the twenty-one liberal arts institutions engaged in programs of self-study for the year 1953. The Chairman of the Curriculum Committee and its Executive Secretary were given half-time off from teaching duties for the spring semester. The other members of the Committee, with certain necessary exceptions, were given one-quarter time off for the same period. Professor James W. Green was added to the Committee to share some of his duties with Professor Allison, and Professor Monroe Berkowitz was appointed to replace Professor Bezanson (who was on leave) and to serve as Executive Secretary. An office was set up in Winants Hall and a part-time secretary was employed. Professor Margaret Judson of N.J.C. was invited to become a consultant of the Committee.

Meanwhile, the Committee had rather slowly resumed its work. The illness of Professor Lane, its chairman, was of course partly responsible for the delay, but the usual confusion attendant upon the opening of the College term played its part. The death of Professor Lane made necessary the election of a new Chairman and late in October Professor Winkler was chosen by the Committee. Until the Christmas recess, the Committee met weekly. Its main effort was an attempt to assess the responses of the department chairmen to the first tentative suggestions which had been outlined in the memorandum of May 7, as noted above. As one of the products of these discussions, the Committee was made clearly aware of the difficulties faced by any proposals for curriculum revision - for example, of the sharply divergent attitudes of the individual departments.

The full-fledged self-study program actually got under way with the beginning of the spring semester of 1953. Immediately upon receipt of the award, Dean Owen asked each department to appoint a self-evaluation committee in order to act as a channel of communication between the Curriculum Committee and the departmental faculty. In addition, he asked that each such departmental committee designate a representative to a divisional committee, whose function it would be to consult with the Curriculum Committee as an interdepartmental unit concerned with common problems. On February 6 the Curriculum Committee met with the departmental representatives for the purpose of explaining its approach and to elicit reactions to a questionnaire which it proposed to circulate. As a result of the discussion, the questionnaire was revised and distributed. This questionnaire was divided into five main sections:

(A) Philosophy of Education. (B) Objectives. (C) Techniques. (D) Personnel. (E) The Basic Course(s) and General Education Requirements. (See Appendix I.) This was the fundamental document of the self-study, for all departments replied - usually at considerable length. One of the major tasks of the Curriculum Committee was to collate and to study these responses.

As a second step, the Curriculum Committee scheduled meetings with each of the twenty-three departmental committees or with individual representatives. Each meeting, which averaged some two hours in duration, was used to explore questions raised by the reports and to talk through problems of fundamental educational policy. The Committee then drafted a brief report which outlined some of the main areas requiring further study and which listed some possibilities for curriculum revision, not as a proposal but as a basis for further discussion. (See Appendix II.) At a series of conferences with the divisional groups set up at the request of Dean Owen this report was discussed and certain of its strengths and weaknesses were assessed.

In addition to these meetings with colleagues, the Committee endeavored to sound out selected members of the student body. Meetings were held with the Arts and Sciences members of Student Council and Cap and Skull and with the Henry Rutgers Scholars. When occasion presented itself individual Committee members took the opportunity to discuss the program of the College with various of the living groups. These meetings were, in the opinion of the Committee, of considerable value in providing insight into the student point of view.

Several sub-committees were also at work. One, under the chairmanship of Professor Charanis and consisting of representatives of some seven departments, studied the question of Area programs. A second, composed of Professors Turner and Pane, undertook to assess the present foreign language requirements. Their reports appear as Appendixes III and IV of this survey.

The Committee conferred during the course of the year with various other

Members of the University community. Dean Woodward of our Newark College of Arts and Sciences helped clarify certain recent curricular changes made there. Mr. Kramer, Director of Admissions, undertook to supply data on projected enrollments, areas from which our students are drawn, etc. Mr. Boocock, Dean of Men, discussed the problem of advising and orientation and Mr. Kirkwood, Director of the Placement Service, informed us of the job opportunities and attitudes of our students. Professor Buros, editor of the *Mental Measurements Yearbooks*, discussed examination practices and possibilities with the Chairman and Executive Secretary. President Jones gave the Committee the benefit of some of his experiences with curriculum development.

Finally, the Committee members visited Lafayette College and Brooklyn College (to confer with fellow self-study committees), New York University (to investigate the integrated course in the Social Sciences), Haverford College (to study the Carnegie-sponsored experiment in the teaching of freshman English), Amherst College (to see the integrated program of underclass education), Harvard University (to look into the general education program in Harvard College), Yale University (to examine the Directed Studies Program), and Michigan State College (to study the Basic College and the testing programs there developed).

The Damocles' sword of a fall deadline has meant that the Committee has been unable to complete all of its plans. In particular, alumni help has not been thoroughly enlisted.. Furthermore, sufficient information has not been obtained relating to enrollment, the projected student body, and the like. But within the limits of time, the Committee feels that its approach has been possibly the most effective. The methods used are not, of course, a scientific approach to the problem, but they have had the value (a) of keeping the faculty informed and (b) of getting reasonably extensive participation by the faculty in the self-evaluation. If such an approach has stimulated faculty discussion of some of the problems of liberal education, the self-study, in the view of the Committee, will have been well worth doing.

GENERAL STATEMENT

In recent years the role of the liberal arts colleges in American universities has had a certain ambiguity. It is easy for faculty members of such colleges, surrounded as they are by the evidences of professional, vocational, specialized, technical education, to question the purposes and the validity of the job they are trying to do. But though we may sometimes lose sight of the key role of liberal arts education, most of us are committed to the view that it is the necessary foundation for virtually the entire kaleidoscope of instruction, training, and research which constitutes the University's service to the people of the State. The importance of a constant effort to improve the caliber of education in the College of Arts and Sciences can scarcely be exaggerated.

In 1926-1927 the Bureau of Education of the United States Department of the Interior completed a survey of Rutgers which became a fundamental instrument in promoting the development of this institution. In the course of its assessment of education in the Arts and Sciences, the Bureau's survey committee made some observations which bear repetition. "The college of arts and sciences," the committee insisted, "is the keystone of a university .... The college of arts and sciences, because of its basic and more general services, is usually in a position to lead and to give tone to the entire University. If this college is deficient in aims, personnel, organization or equipment the effects of these deficiencies will be felt elsewhere. If the aforementioned elements are strong, and high standards of scholarship and administration prevail, the same conditions and standards will tend to prevail in the other divisions of the University.

"Not only does a strong college of arts and sciences give adequate general training to young men and women who are to be the leaders in the State and in society, but it also greatly aids in the selective processes whereby students gravitate toward the particular work of their choice in the graduate departments or the more highly specialized professional schools and colleges. In the light of these facts it is difficult to overemphasize the importance of this fundamental division of the University."

These observations are as valid today as they were in 1927. They summarize the justification, if it be needed, for the time spent by the faculty in this project of self-evaluation. They can be meaningful if the faculty is willing to act in terms of their implications; otherwise they are the most obvious of truisms.

Our concern here is with the College of Arts and Sciences in New Brunswick. It should, however, be noted that the other colleges of arts and sciences in the University have been engaged, in one way or another, in examinations of their purposes and their practices. For example, the Educational Policies Committee of the New Jersey College for Women, after three years of study, has just completed a report to its faculty. This report, interestingly enough, reaches many of the same conclusions which have been reached by the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences. Together with the findings of the other colleges, these two documents, it is to be hoped, will represent first steps in the further development of liberal education at Rutgers.

One section of the NJC report finds a hearty echo among the members of the Curriculum Committee, namely, the appeal for greater coordination of the activities of the colleges of arts and sciences, particularly in New Brunswick. The program of instruction would gain immeasurably by the sharing of certain upperclass courses, by some avoidance of duplication in offerings, by the arrangement of the schedule to make inter-campus education much easier than it is at present. This coordination is essentially a University matter and as such not within the frame of reference of the Committee, but the Committee would urge upon University officials the importance of moving in this direction as rapidly as possible.

Turning to the study of the College of Arts and Sciences, it is noteworthy that many of the general problems emphasized by the present faculty were problems in 1926-1927 as well. While the Curriculum Committee is not the group to study the matter, it feels that it should call attention to the urgent insistence in both periods on the striking inadequacy of physical facilities at Rutgers. As in 1927, the lack of an assembly place, big enough and pleasant enough to permit the student body to meet together frequently in some degree of civilized comfort, appears as one of the major refrains. The faculty is quite concerned about the antiquated facilities for work in the biological sciences, the inadequacy of scientific equipment in such fields as geology and psychology, the need for an adequate classroom building for the social sciences and humanities, the absence of a proper student union building. Though buildings do not make a first-rate College of Arts and Sciences, the faculty is convinced that the present physical plant of the College of Arts and Sciences is a deterrent to the most effective performance of its task.

More important, in the view of the Committee, is the synthesis of our program of undergraduate education as a whole. After reading the comments on liberal education in the current departmental reports, it is somewhat startling to go back to the Bureau of Education survey of Rutgers a quarter of a century ago and read the following: "To the high school student school work has been pretty largely a matter of accepting facts, theories, processes upon faith. He has been busy under close direction in acquiring knowledge; he has worked without much thought as to why the tasks set for him were chosen rather than others, and without much explanation or understanding of the relationship of the elements of his work to each other or to the whole body of knowledge and to life. The ordinary college curriculum has not been designed to enlighten him in regard to these matters. The new student finds upon entrance to college that a multitude of departments have been set up, some of which he must, all of which he may patronize. He is offered no explanation of their relationships nor is he definitely encouraged to think intelligently himself about the value of combining their offerings in the best way to enrich his own mental life. He finds each head of department enthusiastic about his own work and inclined to urge and magnify its importance. Knowledge is compartmentalized, frequently to such an extent that the whole picture is a block puzzle with the blocks disarranged, and it never occurs to the student, nor to his faculty advisors, that after all the whole picture gives more meaning to each part than any part can have by itself." To be sure, this argument was used in support of a proposal to introduce some kind of "orientation course" into the curriculum, but its diagnosis of the weakness of our educational program coincides with that of the faculty in 1953.

This is not to say that nothing has been done between 1927 and 1953. On the contrary, the faculty agrees that much has been accomplished. The major development during this period has stemmed from the work of the University Committee on Educational Policies. On December 9, 1943, that Committee submitted to the University Council its Report on Problems of Post-War Education. By 1945 the recommendations of that report had been transformed into the General Education requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences. Central to the conclusion of the Committee on Educational Policy was the conviction that every student should be required to devote part of his study to each of the three chief fields of educational interest: the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. As one member of that committee phrased it, "Not for a moment would I permit the freshman to construct his own college program out of current whims and ephemeral desires. He must be guided into his real interests and needs, which are determined and provided for by experts of the faculty and administration. There is, I think, a fair amount of agreement today as to what these are. The student of tomorrow will most certainly be living in a world of science and precision instruments; if he is not to be utterly lost in it, he will need at least a bowing acquaintance with the aims and objectives of science, its tools and techniques. Then too he will be living in a society of growing complexity and will be faced with growing numbers of social, economic, and political problems which cannot be solved, or even understood, without broad experience and thorough grounding in the social sciences. And finally if he is to live a rewarding personal life and build a satisfying personal philosophy, he will need the aid and comfort of the accumulated wisdom of the past, stored up in its treasure house of literature and the arts." The result was a program which required each candidate for a bachelor's degree to take, in addition to English composition and a foreign language, two full courses, not both in the same department, from each of the following groups: (a) Humanities; (b) Social Studies; (c) Sciences. The particular courses listed as fulfilling the General Education requirements have been in most cases, though not always, the introductory courses of the particular departments.

Since the introduction of this distribution requirement, certain other experiments have been launched. A cooperative course in the European [illegible] Renaissance has been offered jointly by members of some five departments. Three departments have worked together to present a course in the comparative study of art, music, and literature. A cooperative course in the great religious philosophies of the western world has been added to the curriculum. Interdepartmental programs in American Civilization, Latin American Civilization, and a Russian Area program are now offered in the College. These various courses and programs, designed to break down departmental barriers, are of course elective and hence limited to a relatively small proportion of the student body. Because they represent another approach to the organization of the curriculum, the Area programs have been studied by a special committee and its findings are included in this report. Similarly, the conclusions of a sub-committee on the foreign language requirement form a part of this survey.

As for the General Education requirements, the faculty consensus is strongly in support of their aims. The faculty agrees that they are a considerable improvement over the previous requirements. But there is a strong feeling that they do not go far enough, that in practice they are not doing the job of effectively integrating the basic education program of the College. To take an example, there is some question, in effect, whether two haphazardly selected courses in the social studies can really give the student "broad experience and thorough grounding in the social sciences." This area of general education is by far the major common concern of the faculty. In subsequent sections of this report the Curriculum Committee will attempt to summarize faculty attitudes on the subject.

During the course of the Committee's study several other areas of concern have kept cropping up. The most important, and thus the ones which will be discussed, appeared to be our relations with the secondary schools, advising and counselling, the encouragement of effective teaching, and the development of basic competencies in reading, writing, and speech. Accordingly, the Committee has devoted separate sections of the report to these subjects and, where suitable, has made recommendations for faculty consideration.

Finally, it should be noted that the Committee was first appointed to make proposals for curriculum revision. To the Committee certain proposals seem to flow quite naturally from the evaluation of liberal education at Rutgers which appears in the comments of the faculty. Accordingly, the report contains a series of recommendations, suggesting a possible approach to the future course of curriculum development in the College of Arts & Sciences. The Curriculum Committee hopes that the faculty will accept the recommendations in principle and that the several departments and divisions will take over the task of translating the principle into an effective and improved curriculum.

RELATIONS WITH SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Many of the communications received by the Curriculum Committee have placed considerable stress on the need to improve the College's relations with the secondary schools of the State. Over 85% of our students are graduates of the high schools of New Jersey. As Rutgers becomes more and more integrated with the life of the State, these schools will almost certainly send an increasing proportion of their graduates to Rutgers. It is quite clear that various officers of the University have close contact with high school administrators and a consequent understanding of their programs and problems. The evidence available does not point to the conclusion that a large proportion of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences has either this contact or this understanding. But it is obvious that the faculty is concerned about the fundamental orientation and the preparation of the young men who come to us as freshmen. This concern expresses itself in two ways. The first is a series of complaints about the job being done in the high schools. These may or may not be justified, but they offer little constructive help in suggesting the role that the College may play in improving the situation. The more fruitful approach is the repetition of the question: What can we do about bringing standards in the schools into a better relationship to the needs of our prospective students? Before examining this question, however, it may be useful to indicate some of the faculty attitudes on the matters of orientation and preparation.

There is considerable feeling that entering freshmen have no real sense of the value of a liberal education as opposed to narrow vocational training. This belief is voiced by various departments. The Psychology Department, for example, after stating that we have no well-organized plan to present students with an adequate idea of the aims and purposes of a liberal education, goes on to comment that "apparently few of them have acquired any such idea in the course of their preparatory or high school years." The Physiology

Department suspects that "the objective of almost every student is to acquire specific knowledge so that he can obtain a position." The Geography Department agrees that "many students are especially concerned with the question of whether their college education will further their cause in an occupational sense." And a member of the Economics Department believes that Rutgers students "do not always have an adequate idea of the principles and aims of liberal arts education - at any rate in a great many cases it does not seem to be prominent in their daily actions and thinking."

These quotations typify the faculty's assessment of the outlook of our incoming freshmen. The tendency among many is to blame the high schools, although it is recognized that parental pressures and general societal values do not always place a high premium on a liberal education. But whether the problem is to be traced to the high schools or to the homes, many colleagues feel that it must be tackled in some way. One approach may be to develop much more fully the literature which explains to high school staffs and prospective students the reasons for the emphasis on liberal education in the College of Arts and Sciences. To facilitate such a program, our admissions officers must be more adequately supplied with materials which stress the purposes of liberal education and with data upon which we as a faculty base our case for liberal education. Part of the solution may lie in an improved orientation program in the College itself, as suggested in another section of this report. Part may be sought in a patient building up of close relations with the schools, a matter to be taken up later in this section.

Another problem, which has apparently absorbed more of the attention of the faculty, is that of deficient preparation. The most obvious example, of course, is in what may be called basic literacy. The Committee is told that our students do not know how to read, write, or speak when they come to us. To use the words of the most competent judge, the English Department, "It happens that so many of the high school graduates whom we receive are so inadequately prepared in the elementary forms of correct writing and reading that we are forced to teach material that ought to have been learned in the 9th and 10th grades."

The field of English is not the only one to present problems. The Physics Department finds "the level of physics training in the high schools so diverse that we find it necessary to start pretty much from the beginning. We do expect a reasonable mathematical facility which is frequently lacking." The Geology Department likewise notes that "some of our prospective majors have difficulty because of deficiency in mathematics and phsyics. This may be related partly to the nature of the high school education." The Geography Department is unhappy about the fact that a high percentage of incoming freshmen are unacquainted with basic geographical facts. The History Department comments that while it is more important for the entering student to know how to read and write than to know history, "even the superior high school student is sadly deficient in historical analysis and perspective." This is an attitude fairly representative of the point of view of many of the Social Studies departments - and, it should be added, of other departments of the College as well. There is a tendency to abandon the idea that the student has learned anything worthwhile in the particular subject matter field while in high school. Freshmen courses in many fields are prepared on the frank assumption that the student knows nothing, an assumption which frequently reflects reality.

Certainly, in the light of these attitudes, the whole question of the relations between the College of Arts and Sciences and the schools of New Jersey requires further and careful exploration. For not only should we be concerned about how to handle these problems, but we should also recognize that the picture has another side. The Committee is in no position to summarize the situation from the point of view of the secondary school - or of the student himself. It does know that some students acquire basic skills in high school and that some learn a good deal of history, literature, or whatever it may be. Such students find themselves repeating their last year of high school - or a substantial portion of it - when they enter college. The superior student, therefore, may be handicapped by our present program to as great an extent as others are unprepared to take full advantage of it. Here again, it seems clear, is reason for closer study of our relations with the schools.

From the point of view of the College, what can be done about the problems posed? The answer most frequently given is that we need more communication and liaison with the secondary schools and the State Department of Education. The Committee agrees with this recommendation, but feels that a few words of caution may not be amiss. A breakdown in communications cannot be repaired like a break in a telephone wire. Something more may perhaps be required than the calling of conferences, since the difficulty may be a conflict in ideas and orientation rather than a mere mechanical breakdown which can be automatically spliced.

The faculty, in considering the question of secondary school relations, might profitably keep the following factors in mind: (1) The tremendous increase in enrollments in the secondary schools over the past several generations, multiplying the obstacles in the way of close supervision of the students with the capacity and desire to go on to college. (2) The fact that the high schools, by their very nature, are singularly sensitive to the particular demands of the community, which may include instruction in automobile driving, improving one's personal appearance, dancing - all worthy of some attention in high school but each forcing out the more traditional subjects whose advocates are to be found, unfortunately, too frequently only among the teachers in the liberal arts colleges. (3) The increasing need for high school teachers, which creates a problem the solution of which may not be forthcoming for many years.

(4) The facts that the high school curriculum is not basically designed for the pre-college student and that the costs of educating such a student often make it impossible to set up special curricula for him, whether they be desirable or not. (5) The low pay and the heavy work load of high school teachers, hardly an incentive for scholarly interest in either subject matter or students. Avenues of promotion are largely administrative or supervisory, so that training in these fields is more popular than further education in the basic disciplines.

These conditions add up to the obvious conclusion that high school administrators and teachers often have different outlooks, different ideas, and different problems from ours in the College of Arts and Sciences. They are mentioned, not to argue that closer collaboration will have no result, but to indicate the framework for this collaboration. The mere improvement of communications is not the automatic answer to a difficult problem. It is at least a start, however, and as such deserves serious consideration by the faculty.

How to achieve closer collaboration with the secondary schools is not for the Curriculum Committee to say. It can, however, pass on to the faculty suggestions which have been made and call to its attention experiments which have been tried in this direction. One avenue of approach is the suggestion that faculty members try to participate more fully in organizations where secondary and college teachers have occasion to meet from time to time. The hours taken from scholarly or other College activity might be worth spending if thereby we could come to understand the character of the high school programs and high school teachers could be made more aware of the requirements and aims of the College of Arts and Sciences. Meetings on the campus of high school students interested in particular subjects - or groups of subjects - might well be expanded, if in some way the funds could be made available. The successes of State Science Day and State Mathematics Day might conceivably be incentives to other departments or divisions to attempt something of the same kind. In spite of hard work and considerable time spent, the effort might pay rich dividends in showing high school students and teachers what currently goes on in the various fields at the College - and perhaps might stimulate enthusiasm for preparing to take full advantage of what the College has to offer, to say nothing of attracting better students to the College instead of seeing them go out of state for their education.

Still another approach which has been tried by a few departments is in the so-called articulation conferences supported by the State Department of Education. This approach is most valuable in those departments which correspond to high school disciplines, such as Enlish, mathematics, languages, history, physics, biology, chemistry, etc. The experience of the English Department may serve as an example of the method. Several years ago the State Department of Education took steps to study the articulation between the high school and the college teaching of English. With a Princeton faculty member as general chairman, two committees were formed, one to study literature, the other composition. The committee on literature drew up a report which indicated what the colleges expected from the high schools, what the high schools actually were doing, and how articulation might be improved. The report on composition is in process of completion. If the experiment had died at that point, little might have been accomplished. Instead, the Rutgers English Section took steps to continue the relationship with high school teachers of English. In 1951-52 a dinner meeting was held at which teachers from the schools acted as a panel before the entire English section. In 1952-53, Professor Stephens of the Newark Colleges and Dr. Flury of the State Department of Education arranged a series of conferences between high school teachers of English and successive groups of instructors from the various English departments of the University. The participants generally agree that these steps have resulted in better understanding of common problems. And with understanding may eventually come improvement of standards. Such a program, modified to meet the needs of particular departments, might perhaps aid in promoting knowledge of what is meant by a liberal education and in stimulating interest in the development of the standards of preparation and performance required by liberal education. Taken together with an expansion of the program of reciprocal visitations between Rutgers and various high schools of the State, it could easily be a step in the direction of making more meaningful and realistic our relations with the secondary schools. In this connection, finally, the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences may wish to consider seriously whether much might not be gained by conferring more closely with the leadership of the School of Education, which already serves in many ways as a link between the schools and the College. There is much potential gain for the College, as for the School of Education, in such a cooperative approach to our relations with the secondary schools.

Clearly, then, neither the faculty nor the Committee has a panacea for overcoming the presumably defective orientation and inadequate preparation of our incoming students. The few suggestions made above, however, may help us to go a little way toward coping with the challenge presented by the existing situation.

ACADEMIC ADVISING

Academic advising is not one of the questions which the Curriculum Committee originally thought it necessary to explore. The departmental self-evaluation questionnaire did not specifically ask for information on departmental advising. Yet some twelve departments pressed the opinion, with varying degrees of vehemence, that Rutgers students are not at present given an adequate idea of the aims of a liberal education. And several departments took the position that freshmen are not being given satisfactory academic orientation. Once the Committee started to meet with various groups, it became clear that advising and orientation as at present carried on were considered to be far less than adequate. At almost every meeting dissatisfaction was voiced with present freshman orientation and with the present College system of giving students advice on academic matters. Much the same attitude, though more vigorously expressed, was taken by students who represented the College on Student Council and in Cap and Skull. In general, the reaction of faculty and students interviewed follows: Much more must be attempted in advising students, both at the start of their college career and throughout their four years. Our present Freshman Week is totally inadequate, especially on the academic side. It might be desirable to have two or three weeks devoted to orientation. Since the transition from school to college is often difficult and always important, it would be time well-spent - and a long range economy - to assure that everything is done to facilitate the transition. Throughout the College there is need for an improved advising program carried out primarily by faculty personnel, for the faculty believes that academic advising should not be done in any large measure by professional advisers, nor by a special administrative office. Advice on vocations, psychiatric problems, or extra-curricular affairs should be furnished by specialists, but academic advising should be firmly rooted in the College itself and not, as so often happens by default in present circumstances, in such an office as that of the Dean of Men, which has more than enough to do in its stewardship of the non-academic aspects of student life without bearing informally a large part of the burden of academic advising.

If this summary reflects faculty opinion, it does not, of course, spell out the details of the criticism. With regard to Freshman Week, one such complaint, constantly voiced, is that much attention is given to introducing the student to athletics, to cheers, to extra-curricular activities of all sorts, and relatively little to his main purpose for being in College, which certainly must have something to do with the academic side of education. Most of the critics, though not all, are aware of the provisions for lectures by deans, discussion groups for academic problems, and the like, which are a part of Freshman Week, but they believe - and the Committee must agree - that the academic side of the orientation program, which should be the major side, tends to be minimized and consequently neglected in the rush and pressure of Freshman Week.

As for advising throughout the year, the Committee questions whether all critics have fully examined the implications of their position. It is one thing to say that we must have better advising in the College; it is another thing personally to do something about it. If each member of the faculty really had the motivation as well as the time to interest himself in the welfare of his students, there would be little need for any elaborate, formal, routinized system of advising. Students rely for advice on those in whom they have confidence. They will naturally turn to faculty members who show an interest in and concern for their welfare or, if they find no such faculty members, to fellow students or the Dean of Men's office. In other words, while improvement in the organization of advising can obviously be made, effective results will be obtained only through the individual faculty member's interest and full participation in the program.

From the premise that academic advising is best done by teachers, it follows that our undergraduate academic advising problems should be solved by the teaching staff or by some special group on the teaching staff. Indeed, the College of Arts and Sciences should be responsible for the academic advising of its students from the moment they arrive at the campus. Obviously, then, a large part of the program of Freshman Week for Arts and Sciences freshmen should be taken over by the College.

With regard to "Freshman Week," some such program as the following is recommended: (1) Arts and Sciences freshmen should be more frequently addressed as a body on College academic objectives even at the expense of cutting down on the non-academic aspects of the program. (2) Over the course of the week they should discuss academic problems in small groups, each with a faculty member. Several such discussions might be useful for each group. The faculty member charged with a particular group during Freshman Week should be required as part of his teaching duties to meet periodically with this same group, at least until majors are selected. Further, he should receive reports of progress, attitudes, etc. from professors teaching these men. This "small-group" adviser, then, is envisaged as the one man in the College who is best informed as to the academic performance of the group under his care during the critical first semester or two. (3) For those students who wish such information faculty members should be readily available during this period to discuss departmental or divisional requirements, courses, etc.

During the freshman year, a program of general orientation for the College should be developed. Special lectures touching the objectives of the College should be given to all freshmen, whether in a single body or in divisional groups. In the view of most students (and faculty) interviewed, the present program, which has a superficial resemblance to this proposal, is not fulfilling its purpose. The meaning of the College, as a college of liberal education, needs much greater emphasis than it has been receiving.

In addition, of course, professional advisers, capable of evaluating capacities and aptitudes and of counselling on psychological and vocational problems, should continue to be available as an adjunct to the academic advising. The Committee, however, does not feel itself qualified to go beyond that general statement, since its competence is after all mainly in the academic side of the student's career.

Finally, the Committee would suggest that a more systematic program of departmental advising might pay dividends in better faculty-student relations. During the freshman year, meetings with potential majors might serve a useful purpose, and in the remaining three years, selected teachers in each department should be assigned the responsibility of advising majors. This advising at the departmental level should be more fully recognized as a teaching function of the staff members involved with appropriate reduction in teaching load.

These comments on advising do not propose any radical changes in our present set-up, but they do point to the need for more efficient operation of the system as a whole, for more systematic participation by the teaching faculty (with due relief from other duties), and for the development of the role of the College of Arts and Sciences (as contrasted with the Colleges for Men) in the advising and orientation of its own students. If liberal education as an objective is to be brought home to our students, it will probably most adequately be done by the faculty most concerned with liberal education in the day-to-day routine of their work.

TEACHING

No program of liberal education can have validity if it does not begin with the teacher. The Committee's deliberations, the reports it has received, and the conferences it has held have revealed general agreement that the key to liberal education lies in the proper relationship between the liberally oriented professor and his students. It would probably not be overstatement to say that the attitudes and performance of teachers in their classrooms can mar the best or make the worst curriculum.

A vague dissatisfaction, or at least an uneasy awareness, that in this central area of the quality of teaching we lack dependable criteria may be sensed in the discussions held with the individual departments. Specific criticisms have been comparatively few. If, as one department maintains, general education does not in actual practice work out as well as it should, the causes may be (1) the overstressing of factual material, (2) the excessive reliance on inexperienced teachers, (3) the teaching of general education courses by specialists in such a way as to narrow their meaning, and (4) the placing of an intolerable burden of synthesis upon the student.

The last two points lead into the most significant area of criticism, much of which is merely implied, rather than specifically stated. Department after department stresses the acute need for greater integration in the curriculum. With virtual unanimity they favor the development of broad, well-rounded students in an exciting climate of ideas, where each study shall benefit by an approach broadly humanistic in its historical and esthetic as well as in its technical aspects. Two significant statements may be quoted. First, from the Department of Religion comes the following statement: "What is lacking is the harmonious and simultaneous development of (the student's) qualities and abilities. If an instructor does not see his particular discipline in relation to the over-all aims of a liberal education, he will not or cannot communicate it to his students." And from a member of the Psychology Department: "Strong interdisciplinary sympathy calls for knowledge at least in related subject-matter areas, and implies that teaching should be approached from an interactional viewpoint, i.e., a recognition of the fluidity of boundaries among disciplines. Integration will never come from compartmentalization."

Where does the faculty look for teaching of the sort just described? Many departments urge that underclass instruction should be done, generally speaking, by men of experience rather than by graduate assistants or young instructors. While this sentiment may be utopian as far as financing is concerned, the faculty generally seems to agree that it represents a desirable goal. Secondly, virtually everyone is opposed to the so-called specialist in general education. Throughout the faculty, indeed, there is a suspicion - a healthy suspicion in the view of most members of the Curriculum Committee - of the concept that instructors with some smattering of knowledge and some scattering of training in a variety of fields can communicate a meaningful sense of depth or even of breadth in their contacts with students. The Committee's experiences in its study of other institutions appear to confirm the validity of this attitude. The most successful attempts at integration, we have felt, have been those in which scholars thoroughly trained in their own disciplines have collaborated. This does not mean that a rigid compartmentalization of knowledge into subject-matter fields is to be considered the most desirable approach to under-graduate education at all levels. On the contrary, it merely raises the question, who should collaborate? If the faculty is right in its concern for a closer correlation of the undergraduate program, then, unless there is a willingness among scholars to think in terms of new approaches and new combinations of offerings, the tendency will be toward continuing to abdicate responsibility for the general education of the student to those who may be less competent to provide it.

The Committee is not arguing that only the productive research scholar can be an effective undergraduate teacher. A healthy faculty has room - and an obvious need - for variety in its membership. Precisely because one individual may make his most effective teaching contribution in an entirely different way from another, it would be disastrous to seek a common mold for all undergraduate instruction. Excellence of individual performance, and not a mere mechanical organization of courses (integrated or otherwise) should continue to be our goal. A curriculum can, at the very best, help rather than hinder the individual instructor in his task.

How to promote excellence of teaching is of course the major question. And, as the faculty knows, on this question there is considerable difference of opinion. One point of view may be summed up in this statement from a member of the Economics Department: "Graduate school training and the custom of requiring the Ph.D. put a premium on rather narrow specialization. The prospective faculty member with truly broad inter-disciplinary insights and interests is under the present dispensation still the exception." Recent appointments raise the question whether or not the comment is still completely accurate, but in any case the real issue would seem to be whether there is any place in liberal education for the "scholar-in-breadth" as well as for the "scholar-in-depth." If the answer were in the affirmative, in order to avoid the implied inconsistency of seeking broad educational results through supposedly narrowed instrumentalities, the faculty might need to redefine its conception of research. Most departments have not hesitated to affirm their belief that the relationship between research and effective teaching is close and vital. Perhaps the most eloquent statement is that from the Political Science Department: "No teacher can inspire respect in his students unless he himself has come into contact with the primary sources of knowledge and knows how much effort and pain is involved in the objective pursuit of truth."

The Committee would agree profoundly with the foregoing statement, as would no doubt every faculty member. Some members, however, might raise the question whether such contact with the sources of truth must always result in publication in a specialized journal or whether there is anything essential in the quoted statement which does not apply to the thoughtful reading, or rereading, of a classic text. These questions impose themselves on the faculty as it assesses its performance in undergraduate teaching. The Committee has tried to convey the spirit of such questions in this report, since they have formed a significant part of the faculty's comments in its "self-evaluation" of teaching. Fortunately, for the Curriculum Committee, at least, there are colleagues - on the Committee on Promotions and the Standing Committee on Instruction - whose major efforts are directed to answering some of the questions raised.

The Curriculum Committee, therefore, can perhaps best serve the faculty by summarizing the general commentary as follows: We shall perhaps come nearer achieving our aims when our general education courses are given by teachers who, having satisfied departmental standards of competence and continuing to teach some specialized departmental courses, nevertheless consciously strive with due hope of recognition to push their studies and meditation out to the frontiers where fields meet; who seek well-deserved recognition through excellent teaching in non-specialized courses; and who maintain an informed, critical competence in a variety of directions. Such teachers, conceived not primarily as specialists but as "whole men teaching," would seek by example (still the most effective mode of teaching) to lead their students toward skill in communication, intellectual curiosity and competence, awareness of our world, and breadth of understanding.

All of these departmental suggestions would appear to point to improved teaching as the primary avenue toward increasing the educational effectiveness of the College. Without in any way sacrificing the advances that have been made in promoting scholarly inquiry among our faculty, how can we offer similar encouragement to effective teaching in order to establish a proper balance? Certain specific suggestions can be offered for faculty consideration.

(1) The establishment of a "Teaching Council," comparable to our excellent Research Council. The purpose of this Council would be to stimulate better teaching. It could award grants to teachers who desire free time either to develop a new course, or to undertake reading programs in fields auxiliary to their own, or to experiment with new techniques (e.g. the use of audio-visual aids). The mere existence of the Council would constitute recognition of the importance of the teaching function and thereby encourage interest in effective teaching. These Council grants would enhance the prestige of the recipient and give him a standing in the academic community that is now too exclusively reserved for the recipient of a research grant.

(2) The use of special chairs to bring to the College men who are considered the very best as teachers in their fields. A few extraordinarily gifted teachers would not only be an inestimable stimulus to the student body but would also serve as inspirations for the rest of the faculty. This particular suggestion, as a matter of fact, may already be well on its way toward implementation by the Board of Trustees.

Both these proposals require action by the Administration of the University. But the Committee believes that a useful step will be taken toward the improvement of teaching standards if the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences demonstrates its positive concern by supporting such proposals or by offering alternatives.

Finally, the Committee adds a few additional specific suggestions highlighted by the faculty as bearing on the quality of teaching. Some are recommendations for action by the faculty, others are simply restatements of problems long with us. Some may be turned over to the Teaching Council for implementation. They can be briefly listed as follows: (1) The development by each department of a program for continuous evaluation of the teaching of its courses. (N.B. This has been recommended by the Special Committee on Promotions.) (2) Systematic orientation of new staff-members. (N.B. The Standing Committee on Instruction had such a program in operation during 1952-53.) (3) Lighter teaching schedules and smaller sections. (4) Improvement of research facilities to attract and hold better men. (5) Strengthening of graduate work in certain areas now weak in this respect. (6) Curtailment, insofar as possible, of the practice of filling most vacancies with temporary appointees at instructors' salaries. Most of these suggestions imply the achievement of a better financial position than the College now enjoys, but if we are thinking of the future, we must keep the goal of maximum effectiveness of performance before us. Although the budget may be a constant deterrent to the best teaching, it should not be the sole determinant of academic policy. In the view of the Committee, **the faculty must set** its sights on the "ideal" as it plans for the improvement of teaching. Though this ideal may not be achieved, to seek for less is to abandon a tradition that has been one of the strengths of Rutgers over the course of its history.

READING, WRITING AND SPEAKING

In almost every kind of intellectual activity, language plays an important two-fold part. Clarity and precision of expression are indispensable to the presentation of the results of thought or investigation, but these same qualities are necessary in carrying out the thought processes that lead to the results. A fairly extensive vocabulary is required in dealing with nearly every aspect of human affairs, and any educational system which does not insist on something more than mere literacy is inadequate and incomplete.

The above statement is, we think, an accurate summary of the most widespread series of comments made by the faculty in its consideration of education at Rutgers. The fact that it is obvious is unimportant. What is significant is the real concern revealed throughout all of the reports from the faculty. This insistence on the overriding importance of the teaching of reading, writing, and speech ranges the spectrum of the departments. The Department of Geology, for example, comments that "all students in geology should be able to read and write English," indeed, that proficiency in the use of the language is next in importance to the major itself. Political Science declares that "ability to use the English language effectively is indispensable." Consequently, its members try constantly to urge upon their students "the importance of accurate understanding and expression." Romance Languages, too, stresses the "ability to receive and transmit thoughts accurately and effectively in English." The Department of Mathematics insists that we teach our students "to read and interpret properly and give precise expression to ideas." More specifically, colleagues in American Civilization assert that "all graduates should read critically, write effectively, and talk intelligently" and that "good writing is basic to education." And a member of the Philosophy Department considers that "one of the foremost qualities of our college graduate would be the capacity to use language - to manufacture a respectable sentence."

These examples deal with general goals. A fairly substantial group within the faculty contends that these goals are not being achieved. This group feels either that something is lacking at Rutgers in the teaching of communication, or that, in any case, the product we turn out is deficient in his ability to express himself effectively. A member of the Economics Department, for example, writes that "inability to communicate orally or in writing is one of the serious problems we have with a considerable segment of our student population." The Department of Physiology and Biochemistry states that "at the sophomore level...we find fully half of our students do not write English with satisfactory proficiency." The Department of Botany seems to attribute the poor writing at Rutgers to inability to read: "Many of our students have little facility in reading the English language; as a consequence they can hardly be expected to write it intelligently." Much more severe than these general departmental judgments is the censure which comes from another colleague: "As it is, students get through English 101-102 without being able to write... I know how firmly English 101-102 is entrenched here (and elsewhere), but I know also that the present products of the system can graduate as illiterates." Such a comment, while it may be exaggerated, does point to a situation that is obvious to anyone who reads or listens. From their habits of speech, or writing, or reading, many of our graduates, to put it bluntly, could not be recognized as college-trained. That this deficiency exists among many graduates of most American colleges - and the Curriculum Committee's brief visits to other institutions seem to offer evidence for such a conclusion - does not lessen our obligation to cope with the problem. Indeed, the fact that the same complaint has been heard from generations of college teachers does not make the criticism any the less serious. To a very large degree, whether we are successful or unsuccessful in undergraduate general education is determined by how well we handle this particular aspect of it.

Since the job of teaching reading and communication is the responsibility of the entire College faculty, it is patently unfair to expect the English Department, to solve this problem single-handed. All incoming freshmen are required to take the basic course in the English Department. English 101-102 is, so to speak, the most universal of our courses in the College. It is, therefore, the one in which all of the faculty appears to have a vital interest, for it is specifically aimed at teaching "clear and forceful writing" (to quote the curricular self-evaluation of the English Department.) What little comparative information we have seems to reveal that, on the whole, this course here at Rutgers is superior to its counterparts in most colleges and universities. Nevertheless, it has been subjected to certain criticisms which may perhaps lead to the comforting conclusion that at least the faculty is setting its sights fairly high. In any case, if the Curriculum Committee is to do its job properly, these criticisms must be reported to the faculty as a whole. They tend to group themselves into three classifidations: (1) Adverse comments on the teaching of formal grammar to college freshmen; (2) the feeling that the student is not exposed to enough literature, especially in the B sections (i.e., the less advanced sections) of English 101-102; (3) the absence of formal instruction in speech in this course or at least in the student's work in this field.

Taking up the objections separately, the Committee notes that most frequently criticized is the teaching of grammar, to which all but a few students in the so-called A sections are presumably subjected. There is a considerable feeling that instruction in formal grammar or even in the formal principles of composition, while it might be effective in elementary and secondary schools, defeats its purpose at the college level by decreasing the student's motivation to write at all. Whether a reasonable knowledge of English grammar is essential for writing clear, straightforward English prose is perhaps better answered by the English Department than by the rest of the faculty. It is at least clear that, unlike the English departments in many colleges and universities, ours is realistically cognizant of the fact that our entering students are woefully deficient in grammatical knowledge. Thus we have a non-credit course in remedial grammar required of those who fall below a certain standard. Actually, some of the criticism may be based on a misconception of the nature of the Freshman Composition course. Some colleagues may be confusing the remedial work with the teaching of composition in the required course. In any case, the point of view is noted for whatever use may be made of it.

A second criticism of the present course in English Composition is that it does not include enough literature. Indeed, according to the report of the English Department, "a weakness in the course, as some instructors see it, is that very little literature is actually taught." On the other hand, a member of the department points out to the Committee that many of the sections of English 101-102 concentrate heavily on literature. Perhaps the simplest summation of faculty views on the subject is that in such a course as English Composition the major purpose of the materials read should be to improve the student's ability to read with understanding and to write with clarity.

The third possible criticism of the present course is the absence of formal teaching in speech or oral communication, which most of the departments of the College deem as essential as writing for the truly well-educated graduate. If an element of such instruction could be injected into the present work, this objection might presumably be eliminated.

The Curriculum Committee cannot assess the merits of these various comments. Assuming that the three criticisms have some validity, the faculty as a whole should give thought to possible remedies. Our own limited experience during the course of this survey can, however, be summarized. The ostensible purpose of the readings in the 101-102 course is to provide motivation for writing and discussion, in other words, to stimulate ideas. Our observation of successful experiments at Haverford and at Amherst has shown two different ways of providing this motivation. At Haverford the English Department carefully selects a list of readings following a theme designed to acquaint the student with "human values." This year, for example, the theme was "the inner life, the outer life, the complete life." In the light of this theme the student reads the assigned selections and correlates the ideas in them. After discussing them with his classmates and his instructor, he writes on subjects stemming from this discussion. At Amherst, the student's writing in courses other than Freshman Composition becomes a part of his work in his English course. It is marked both by his English instructor and by his instructor in the particular course.

Both of these programs have obvious merits and equally obvious drawbacks, one of which is their expense. A third approach has been suggested at Rutgers by Professor Davis of the English Department, who has applied for funds in order to establish a writing laboratory here. A group of graduate assistants in the social sciences under the supervision of a chairman would work with students on writing assignments using materials from the various social sciences. Whether freshmen are really prepared to write in a special field in the face of deficiencies of factual knowledge and a specialized vocabulary may perhaps be tested by such an experiment.

Whatever the merits of any of these programs, the Curriculum Committee urges that they be studied carefully - and more information than the Committee has will be needed - by the English Department and by the faculty. It does seem clear that in whatever approach may be judged most fruitful, much greater care should be taken in the correlation of readings and written exercises than is traditional in American courses in composition. Half the battle would be won if a better student - teacher ratio were to be achieved, and the Curriculum Committee strongly urges the need for such a reduction in the size of classes in composition.

To place the whole burden on the English Department, however, is quite unrealistic. It is coming more and more to be recognized that the separation of instruction in communication from the general instruction in the colleges may have been a grave mistake, since the problems of expression are a function of every subject in the general education of the student. But recognition of this problem, in most instances, has not led to any effective approach to its solution. There are some exceptions, like the Amherst experiment noted already, or the Davis proposal here at Rutgers. These appear to be steps in the right direction, but no real solution will be in sight until the faculty as a whole takes action to back up its insistence upon the need to turn out graduates who can read, write and speak. We would urge each department, preferably with the advice of the English staff, to adopt a definite and detailed plan for restoring language values into its courses.

This action can take various forms. For one thing, there must be a critical re-examination of tests, quizzes, and examinations with a view to providing more opportunity for self-expression on the part of the student. There must, in other words, be greater attention to the preparation of tests in all fields that require the student to exhibit his competence by formulating and expressing his own thoughts. True, the grading of an essay-type examination paper requires much more time and patience from an instructor. On the other hand, the construction of an objective test - if it is to be a good one - is even more time-consuming and frustrating, as all who have had this cleansing experience will testify. A bad test of this kind can be thrown together with ease, but this only transfers the frustration to the student, and tells the instructor virtually nothing about the student. Hence the extra time required to read and grade an essay question (and if necessary to have the student rephrase it in correct form) is not as great as one might think, and the rewards make the expenditure of some additional time worthwhile, especially if we are genuinely interested in the overall education of the student rather than merely in his grasp of the subject matter of an individual course.

If comprehensive examinations are put into effect in the College as a whole, some sort of expert group might well be established to work with the various divisions and departments in an advisory capacity in connection with the construction of these examinations. By offering counsel on question construction techniques this group could grealy improve the quality and effectiveness of quizzes and examinations all over the campus, particularly as far as expression is concerned.

There are many other ways of encouraging the student to improve his powers of expression and comprehension that can be directly articulated with all subjects and not simply with "English." If the faculty is really concerned, as it appears to be, then all of us will quite literally make instruction in reading, writing, and speaking a part of the work of our courses. An obvious first step is that we recognize our obligation to afford our students a worthy example in these respects. If we do not demonstrate our concern by positive action - and the dissatisfaction with the present situation seems to indicate that we do not - then we cannot expect to "let the English Department do it" and continue to grumble about results.

SPECIAL REPORTS: FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND AREA PROGRAMS

Two special committees, appointed by Dean Owen and directed to serve as sub-committees of the Curriculum Committee, were asked, one to study the place of the foreign language requirement in the College and the other to evaluate the present Area programs and report on the possibility of furthering the area program curriculum. Their reports have been considered and merit some brief comment.

I. Foreign language requirement.

In the view of the Curriculum Committee, the argument in support of maintaining a foreign language requirement is extremely strong. The Committee recognizes the difficulty of achieving in practice all of the aims described in the special report. It does not feel, however, that any present failure to reach the full goal of a foreign language requirement is a valid argument for abandoning it, as has occasionally been suggested on the campus. Rather it believes in putting the language departments squarely on the spot, in urging the faculty to insist that the values of foreign language training - for any student - are sufficiently great to dictate the highest standards of performance. The possibility that the job may be incompletely done in the case of a particular student does not mean that it should not be done at all. It means that it should be done better.

The Committee is also impressed by the argument against making a "reading knowledge" the criterion of language proficiency. A committee of experts is not needed to explain that this has been a serious - perhaps the major - weakness of language instruction in most schools and colleges for some time. If language study is to contribute to a liberal education as it should, then it must be conceived in terms broader than the mere acquisition of tools needed in specialized disciplines. Many of the values of a properly-taught foreign language, as described in the report, can be attained only by experience in listening, speaking, and reading - there is no easy substitute.

As a consequence, the Curriculum Committee supports the implied recommendation of the sub-committee, which strongly favors the maintenance of a language requirement. (See Appendix III.) It feels, however, that emphasis should be placed more on performance than on putting in time. Accordingly, it proposes to the faculty that the language requirement be rephrased. Students who can achieve the standard at present expected after two years of College language study should be given credit for fulfilling the language requirement, whether they are able to reach this standard after one year or two. If the student can meet this standard upon entering college, the Committee suggests, not that he be required to take another language for two years (as is usual under the present system), but that he be required to go on for at least one year in an advanced course, preferably in the literature of the language. Under this plan most students would undoubtedly require two years as at present, but real proficiency would be rewarded by reducing the requirement to one year of advanced work, and thereby freeing the student either to take additional work in another field or to push on more fully into the literature of the language. In the Committee's opinion, this change would provide a real incentive for top performance on "placement" examinations. It would combat the occasional tendency for students to do poorly in placement tests in order to be placed in elementary sections and thus get a "free ride" through their college language courses.

II. Area programs.

The Curriculum Committee feels that the report of the Area program subcommittee very well sums up the prospects and the problems of this approach to undergraduate education. It supports the resolutions of the sub-committee which advocate the strengthening of our present program in specific ways and which recommend that no additional Area programs be inaugurated until the facilities needed for them are forthcoming and until the existing programs have been fully developed. The Curriculum Committee proposes that the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences go on record as approving the sense of those resolutions. (See Appendix IV.)

More specifically, the Committee would like to draw attention to several of the findings of the Area program sub-committee. As pointed out, the absence of work in anthropology and the need to develop certain fields in sociology are serious flaws in our curriculum. We should strongly urge that the faculty ask, in particular, that the administration find ways and means to restore and develop the vital study of anthropology in the College. Secondly, the Committee notes with approval the emphasis placed on the need to develop the offerings in foreign languages. Except in the American Civilization program, these are essential, and until the College of Arts and Sciences has sufficient language offerings and sufficient library resources to permit serious work in those languages, most Area programs - even on the undergraduate level - will run the risk of being mere mechanical arrangements of courses which put a premium on superficiality rather than discipline. We should attempt to do only what we can do well.

Also, because of this concern for fundamental educational discipline, the Committee welcomes the minority report presented by two members of the sub-committee. As noted elsewhere in this report, the Curriculum Committee feels that the most fruitful collaborative teaching results from the cooperation of men who are themselves deeply grounded in their particular fields. It believes that Area programs should be truly inter-departmental. They should perhaps be administered and tied together by men whose major interest is in the Area program, but should draw their staff for the most part from experts within the various existing departments. The Area programs themselves should continue to rest largely upon the courses offered by the various departments. Indeed, it seems to the Committee that the faculty should insist oh fuller participation by the departments in the programs, and resist any tendency to set up completely separate "Area departments," with separate area staffs. Just as an interdepartmental course in, for instance, the social sciences can be effective if it is the result of the collaboration of specialists, so can the civilization program which makes fullest use of the special competencies of the various departments be a most effective educational device. The Curriculum Committee doubts that such a program taught almost exclusively by a separate staff can be so effective. It supports, therefore, the implications of both majority and minority sub-committee reports, which insist on the maintenance of the inter-departmental character of these programs.

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

Central to any "self-evaluation" of the College of Arts and Sciences is the question, "What are the qualities and abilities that you would like to see in the graduates of the College?" What, in other words, should be the philosophy of education that lies behind all of the complicated operations of the College? The Curriculum Committee has neither the mandate nor the intention to "sell" a statement of educational philosophy which will represent its own views as they have emerged during the course of a year and a half of discussion. Self-evaluation, if it is to be really meaningful, must represent the considered judgment of as wide a segment of the faculty as possible. Accordingly, while the Committee has sought information and insight in meetings with students and administrators, in studies of the curricula and the experiences of other institutions, and in first-hand observations of various educational experiments, it has primarily looked for guidance from the written statements of each department and from the meetings with departmental and divisional representatives. In this way it has hoped to make its study a genuine faculty self-study and to base its recommendations on the findings emphasized by the faculty itself.

The faculty generally agrees that the undergraduate must be given a thorough training in the methods, modes of thought, and data of some specialized discipline or combination of disciplines. The faculty, on the whole, is skeptical of the educational value of a program devoted solely to general education, whether it be oriented about great books or basic ideas or any other such device currently employed. While there is wide agreement - with few exceptions - that the College can be no mere training school, there is nevertheless a strong feeling that one of its legitimate functions is to push the student toward a degree of specialized competence on which he can rely. This is not to say that the College must be expected to give him all the tools necessary to do a particular job, nor that an exclusively vocational motivation is to be encouraged. There is considerable sentiment - with which the Committee agrees - that the student should be enabled, fairly early in his college career, to begin to direct his attention toward developing competence in a particular field, not only because to do so satisfies his legitimate vocational aspirations, but because depth, thoroughness, and concentration are in themselves prime educational values. This attitude on the part of the faculty serves to make clear one of the major strengths of our educational program in the College of Arts and Sciences, namely, that the College is at present doing its best job in this area of specialized training. The Committee, for its part, is convinced that the faculty is right in its judgment. Indeed, on any comparative basis our academic standards rank with the highest in the country, and our students, in most areas, are exceptionally well-trained in their major fields. Of course this characteristic of a Rutgers education must be maintained and fostered as one of the fundamental strengths of our program.

In addition to its insistence on the value of specialized work in a particular field, the faculty asks that the student be helped to know the nature of the world about him - something of its physical characteristics and its societal organization and problems and also something of how man and nature have come to be what they are. It further notes that he should have some sense of the cultural heritage of his civilization and some standards of judgment with which to expand his aesthetic and moral horizons. All this knowledge, finally, must be accompanied by an ability to communicate easily with his fellows. This overall pattern is to be sought in the program of general education, however it may be set up, and should be realized through appropriate offerings in the three divisions of the College. A broad general background, it is agreed, is not only desirable in itself, but is invaluable for the adequate pursuit of any vocational or professional career on any but the most routine level.

This analysis can be illustrated most strikingly in the field of business preparation which has been called to the Committee's attention. The Committee feels that it is hardly the function of the College of Arts and Sciences to graduate men who are highly skilled in the routine aspects of some specialized task but who have little in the way of a broad general background. In this field as in others, it is difficult to know where to draw the line between general and specialized education. At the present time, most students preparing for business careers enroll in the business administration curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences. Although they take some specialized courses in this field, their work is an integral part of the program of liberal education required of every student in the College. Having considered the various alternative methods of preparing students for business careers and having examined the recent pronouncements of business leaders on the appropriate educational preparation for business, the Committee is convinced that at the undergraduate level training in business can be most effectively achieved within the framework of liberal education. The Committee recognizes the demand on the part of incoming students for a program which will prepare them for business positions. At the same time, it believes that it is the duty of the faculty to insist upon the proper balance between such specialized training and the more intangible elements that go into the making of an educated business man. In the view of the Committee, this balance, at the undergraduate level, can best be achieved within the program of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The conclusions of the faculty - and of the Committee - can be further illustrated from the answers to the questionnaire which the Committee submitted to the departments on February 9 1953. Having asked, "What are the qualities and abilities that we would like to see in the graduates of the

College?", the Committee expected, in all frankness, to receive responses which would run a very wide range of opinion and which might be contradictory and mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, though there have been differences of opinion among the faculty, on the whole the area of agreement is remarkably large. In general, apparently, most of us have the same ideal graduate in mind. The following typical illustrations will indicate the nature of the responses received. One department has drawn up the following list of hoped-for qualities and abilities of a graduate of the College: "(a) a reasonably thorough knowledge of one field; (b) a familiarity with and appreciation of the main fields of knowledge and culture and the interrelation of the same; (c) the capacity to make a critical analysis of a situation and to form independent judgments; (d) the possession of intellectual curiosity." Another such list is composed of "(a) a basic concept of western civilization with an integrated factual subject matter knowledge in the three fundamental areas of the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences, plus a more intimate familiarity with one chosen field (major); (b) literacy, i.e., the ability to express himself well orally and in writing; (c) intellectual curiosity; (d) analytical and critical ability; (e) taste and discrimination in literature, music and the arts; (f) worldmindedness, including tolerance." And from still another department: "The graduate of the College of Arts and Sciences ought to be above all an educated man and a good citizen. He should be a man with cultivated tastes, a developed sense of values, the capacity to judge soundly of men and events, and he should be equipped with the historical perspective necessary for understanding his times."

In a sense, of course, any such statements could be no more than the overworked clichés which abound in academic - as in other - circles, for they are the most general of propositions and without detailed specification and implementation they are virtually meaningless. But conceived as the basis upon which education at Rutgers now rests and as the general framework within which educational development may take place in the future they provide a useful clue to an assessment of the foundations of our program of liberal education. The faculty, then, seems committed to the view that an effective liberal education is to be sought in a balance between the specialized and the general in a student's training. It believes that the task of specialized instruction is on the whole, being well handled. It further feels that the aims of the present general education requirements, which attempt to ensure at least a minimum distribution of instruction in most of the broad areas of knowledge, are logical and desirable. The Committee likewise is unanimous in its endorsement of the purpose of the general education requirements.

Nevertheless, from these same reports the Committee gathers that the faculty is not convinced that the present program of general education, good as it is, fulfills the stated objectives as well as it might. Again the Committee, on the basis of its study, tends to agree. The major deficiencies of the present arrangements, as seen by the Committee, may be readily summarized. (1) Our student body has very little in the way of commonly-shared educational experiences. In a college, a considerable portion of whose students do not live on campus, the development of a sense of community, of joint endeavor in seeking worthwhile goals, is difficult enough at best. One of the purposes of general education, as the members of the Committee have thought the problem out, should be to provide some "common experience" - some areas within the curriculum (to put it at its most mechanical) which are jointly shared by most of our students and which will help create some few common foci for the interchange of intellectual experiences. (2) The present pattern of general education is perhaps too loose. Beyond a mechanical distribution of courses its full educational purpose is as unclear to students as to faculty. It provides little in the way of a perspective for the specific courses a student takes. (3) Thus professional and vocational aims tend to become the only significant criteria of the student's educational experience - at least in his eyes. This tendency on the part of our students has been so greatly emphasized by the faculty as to leave the impression that it is a general phenomenon. (4) Since courses outside the student's major and related fields are often selected virtually at random, and indeed often by wrong criteria, he is almost inevitably limited in his ability to see interrelationships and the overall social and personal significance of his various courses.

Our aim, therefore, should be to overcome these weaknesses in order better to achieve the purposes set down by the faculty in its discussion of liberal education. As one department has put it: "Although every individual is limited in his powers, the University may, for practical purposes, be regarded as unlimited in its possibilities, and therefore it should attempt to offer, through its several divisions and departments, as nearly ideal a milieu for the personal development of its students as its faculty can conceive. Shortcomings and failures there will be, but the ideal must be the goal."

Ideally, of course, given the teachers who are aware of the purposes of liberal education and who are willing to see the relationship of their subject matter to those purposes, these aims can be implemented through any combination of courses in any department. Certainly, the objectives should be sought in every course. Work in science can be taught in the spirit of "liberal" education - and often is so taught. Work in the social studies and in the humanities does not necessarily in itself guarantee that a student will be liberally educated, for in the final analysis it is the quality of a course, the direction in which it tries to point the student, and above all the character and the skill of its professor which determine its success or failure in the overall scheme of general education.

On the other hand - and again we elaborate the obvious for emphasis -

certain disciplines, leaving aside their role in the communication of specialized knowledge, are better suited for particular roles in any program of general education. (Parenthetically, the Committee holds fast to the perhaps old-fashioned notion that a prime responsibility of the College of Arts and Sciences is to help the student acquire the knowledge upon which to build a reasoned life. We do not feel that to deprecate the acquisition of facts and skills is in itself a criterion of belief in liberal education, as some educators apparently consider it to be.) To take an example, in our highly complex modern world, to which the contribution of science is of such importance, the student should clearly be brought to grips with some of the fundamental problems of science, should have some feeling for the how and why of "science as discovery." While he may get some insights into this from other disciplines - from philosophy, history, even literature - it is to the scientist that he must go for his basic education in this field. The same thing holds true for art, for economics, for history. The point being made is this: that we on the faculty would do ourselves a disservice if we were simply to say that all disciplines are liberal if so taught, and then use this as a justification for our reluctance to think through our undergraduate program as a whole and the contributions of each discipline to it. Any careful study of this problem, as it has been faced by American colleges and universities, would seem to point to the conclusion that faculty decisions must be made in the light of the overall educational picture, rather than only in departmental terms. It would seem necessary to decide which disciplines or combinations of disciplines can best be utilized at Rutgers in order to ensure that our students use our facilities liberally to educate themselves. Such decisions, it should be emphasized, must come ultimately from the faculty itself and not from any small committee of its membership. The most that the Curriculum Committee can do is to present recommendations which have grown out of its study of faculty opinion and out of its own discussions and urge that the faculty give them careful consideration.

GENERAL CURRICULUM RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Introduction

A major conclusion which flows from the present self-study of the College of Arts and Sciences is the need for a closer relationship among the various offerings which now make up our vehicles for general education. After a considerable discussion of the reports of the faculty as well as a study of programs elsewhere, the Committee is convinced that part of the solution to the problem lies in the institution of a series of comprehensive examinations in the three broad divisions of instruction - humanities, sciences, social studies. These examinations should be an integrating device, designed to facilitate the achievement of some sense of overall relationship in that part of a student's program usually referred to as "general education." As the Committee sees it, these examinations should each be based on the equivalent of two years of work in a particular division, and each should be made up to test (a) the student's general competence in the division, and (b) his grasp of a more specialized subject within the division. The examinations in the three divisions should set definite hurdles or duties before every student in the College, regardless of major. They should be flexible enough to permit a student to take two at the end of the sophomore year and one at the end of the junior year, or the reverse, depending upon his particular program. As a general practice, the Committee would suggest that such examinations should be in substantial measure of the essay type, in order that powers of expression, and not merely the acquisition of data, should be subjected to a real and searching test and receive due weight in evaluating a student's performance.

The Committee also believes that in each of the three divisions a new course or courses should be developed in order to serve as optional preparation for the general part of the divisional examination. These courses should not be taught by a special "general education" faculty, but should be devised and taught by departmental specialists who would collaborate in this task of general education. The courses, in other words, should not be substitutes for secondary school courses, as they seem to be in some places. They need not cover all of the individual disciplines of any one division so long as their emphasis is primarily on the broader aspects of the materials of the division. Their precise nature must be determined by the divisions themselves. The Committee also feels that a reorganization of division patterns might effect a more logical distribution of work in general education. For example, the following arrangement might be explored:

1) Social Studies. All students should be required to pass a general examination consisting of two parts: the first part should cover the student's knowledge of the dynamics of contemporary society, the second part should provide the option of an examination in the work of a particular course in one of the individual departments of the division. No specific course should be required of all students before they are able to take this examination. In order to prepare students, however, the division should offer an introductory course in which various departments would cooperate. Normally, a student might take this integrated course plus a course in either economics, political science, psychology, sociology, or geography as preparation for his general examination. Since work in history would be covered by another general examination listed below, history is not included in this group. Furthermore, a student majoring in social studies normally would not take the integrated course since sometime early in his academic career he would probably have taken a sufficient number of courses in these disciplines to enable him to pass the general examination.

2) Heritage of Western Civilization, (history, literature, classics, philosophy, religion.) All students should be required to pass a general

examination consisting of two parts: the first should cover the student's knowledge of some of the bases and traditions of western civilization; the second should concentrate on one field in this division. For the purpose of preparing the student, a course, centering about several of the fields listed as in #1 above should be devised. Similarly, a major in one of these departments would normally not take the integrated course.

3) Science. All students should be required to pass a general examination in science which would be divided into two parts, one covering the physical sciences, i.e., physics and chemistry, and the other covering the biological and earth sciences. A student should be required to take one of these parts. As preparation for these science examinations, the respective departments should prepare two three-semester introductory courses. Some students might prefer to take two one-year courses in either of the fields of the general examination rather than the three-semester integrated course. This election would not only prevent the general examination from being simply a final examination for the integrated course, but it would ensure that the departmental courses give some attention to the interdisciplinary relationships which should be part of the experience of all students taking science.

In addition, the Committee deplores the present equation of the mathematics requirement with that of science. This relationship, indeed, may be at the base of much of the criticism of the mathematics requirement revealed in departmental reports. Mathematics is, of course, a tool for the sciences and, as such, certain mathematics courses must be required of science majors. Similarly, certain mathematics courses are invaluable for social science majors. But mathematics as a symbolic language also is essential to a liberal education. In this aspect, it equates more nearly with the discipline of formal logic. Hence, the Committee recommends the requirement of some standard of achievement in either mathematics or logic. It would propose that every student be required to pass an examination in mathematics or in logic, either as part of the general examination in the division of his major or as a separate examination based on the standards expected after the completion of a one year College course in the particular subject. As optional preparation for these examinations attention should be given to devising a new course or courses in mathematics designed especially for students in the humanities and/or the social studies. Individual departments, if they so desired, could prescribe the choice taken by their students.

The Committee has also come to feel that a one-year requirement in the "fine arts" would be of considerable benefit to our students. Our analysis, which has revealed the overwhelmingly vocational orientation of our students, leads to the conclusion that an introduction to this area of individual appreciation and expression is virtually indispensable to a balanced liberal education.

In addition, the Committee would urge each department to reexamine all of its offerings to be sure that a student, in selecting his specialized courses, is provided with breadth of experience as well as depth of training.

Finally, the Committee would leave it to the faculty as a whole to determine whether the Curriculum proposals listed below, if acceptable, should be adopted for the entire student body or should be tried on an experimental basis for a period of years with a part of the incoming students, for example, one-third of each class.

II. Recommendations

1. That the faculty approve in principle the use of divisional comprehensive examinations as a unifying device in the College program of general education.

2. That the faculty approve in principle the introduction of optional integrating courses in three divisions: social studies, science, "heritage of

western civilization."

2a. That the faculty approve the appointment of divisional committees, with time released from other duties, to consider and to recommend to the faculty by the end of the present academic year the nature and content of the respective integrated courses and general examinations.

3. That the faculty approve in principle the establishment of the requirement that each student pass an examination in mathematics or logic as part of his general education program.

3a. That the faculty approve the appointment of a committee to devise and recommend suitable optional courses as preparation for the mathematics - logic examination, this committee to be established on the same basis as the divisional committees proposed in 2a.

4. That the faculty approve the introduction of a one-year requirement in the fine arts (art, music, or drama) for all students.

5. That the faculty approve the following modification of the foreign language requirement: All students will be required to pass an examination which will test their knowledge of one foreign language. This examination will be based on a standard at present expected of students who complete the two-year College program in the particular language. Those students who pass the examination without previous College work will be required to take one year of instruction, in that language normally a course with specific literary and cultural content.

III. Summary of Other Recommendations Appearing in Self-Study Report

A. General

1. That the faculty approve in principle the rearrangement of the schedules of the College of Arts and Sciences and the New Jersey College for Women in order to permit closer collaboration, particularly in the offering of

specialized courses.

2. That the faculty reiterate its insistence that substantial improvement of sub-standard physical facilities, in buildings, equipment, and other aids to teaching and research, is imperatively needed to promote the most effective performance of its duties.

B. Teaching

3. That the faculty request the University administration to explore the possibility of establishing a Teaching Council with the following functions: to administer funds for the purpose of encouraging experimentation and improvement of teaching by individual faculty members; to coordinate the study and the evaluation of methods for the improvement of teaching in the College.

4. That the faculty approve in principle the occasional invitation to New Brunswick of visiting professors with outstanding reputations as excellent teachers, in order further to stimulate interest in the maintenance of high standards of teaching.

C. Reading, Writing, and Speech

5. That the faculty recommend to the English department a complete reexamination of the present required course in English composition in the light of the report of the Curriculum Committee. That the English department make proposals to the faculty for the strengthening of the offering in English composition.

5a. That the faculty strongly urge all departments to reexamine the standards of English usage demanded of their students. That the departments be asked to explore methods (for example, the fuller use of written papers) of insisting on high standards of performance in English in all classes of the College of Arts and Sciences.

D. Advising

6. That the faculty request that a substantial portion of a student's

time during Freshman Week be devoted to academic advising and consideration of academic matters. That this program be under the guidance of teaching members of the Arts and Sciences faculty.

7. That the faculty recommend the fuller development of a program of general orientation during the Freshman year, in which the aims and purposes of a liberal education are made more meaningful than at present to the students.

8. That the faculty recommend that advising at the departmental level be recognized as a teaching function and teaching loads reduced for members assigned to heavy advising duties.

F. Relations with Secondary Schools

9. That the faculty recommend that the Dean of the College explore with the Dean of the School of Education the problem of closer liaison with the secondary schools on academic matters of interest to the College of Arts and Sciences.

10. That the faculty approve in principle the development of other divisional and departmental programs on the order of "State Science Day" and "State Mathematics Day" and the articulation conferences with teachers in the secondary schools. That it urge the departments and divisions to make fuller use of such means of improving relations with the secondary schools in the task of edu- educating young men.

F. Area Programs

11. That the faculty adopt the four recommendations of the sub-committee on Area programs (see appendix), subject to the insistence on the interdepartmental character of these programs and accepting the principle that most of the participants in these programs should be scholars who take as their principle field of interest specific disciplines in the area concerned.

12. That the faculty urge the Administration to find ways and means of restoring the study of Anthropology to the curriculum.

APPENDIX I

MEMORANDUM

Box 563, Winants Hall
February 9, 1953

TO: Departmental Representatives - Curricular Self-Evaluation
FROM: Henry R. Winkler, Chairman, Curriculum Committee

In accordance with the recommendations made by the departmental representatives on February 6th, the Curriculum Committee has revised its suggested guide sheet for the departmental self-evaluation reports. We have tried to condense the materials as much as possible, while trying to indicate, for the use of the departments, those questions and suggestions which have come to us from faculty members. We recognize that not every department will feel the need or the desirability of reporting on every one of the specific questions.

The enclosed form is intended as a guide to the departments, not as a "questionnaire." At the same time, we hope that the general areas indicated will receive careful consideration, in order that the reports may be as complete and informative as possible.

In cases where there is no departmental consensus on particular matters, may we suggest that individual faculty members be encouraged to transmit their views to the Curriculum Committee, either through the departmental representative or directly.

We should like to suggest that the smaller departments submit their reports by March 1st. Other departments may require more time, but we should receive all preliminary reports by March 20th. This is of course a serious time limitation, but the Curriculum Committee is faced, like the departments, with a deadline and must do its job within that limited framework.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
NEW BRUNSWICK NEW JERSEY

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, FEB. 9, 1953

DEPARTMENTAL SELF-EVALUATION

A. Philosophy of Education

1. What are the qualities and abilities that you would like to see in the graduates of the College of Arts and Sciences?

2. Does your answer to the preceding question require any modification or elaboration in the case of a College of Arts & Sciences which is a central unit of the State University?

3. In what respect does the College meet the criteria listed above?

4. In what respect does your department meet the criteria listed above?

5. In your view,are present and prospective students given an adequate idea of the aims and purposes of a liberal education at Rutgers? If not, is it desirable that this be done? Suggestions?

B. Objectives

1. Do you feel that the College's function can be divided into: (a) general education and (b) preparation for an occupation or profession? If so, which of the two tasks is better performed by the College? By your department?

2. What are the specific aims of your department in the preparation of students majoring in your field? At present, how successful do you feel you are in achieving your aims?

3. To what extent are these aims influenced by the requirements of professional societies or graduate schools in your field or related fields?

4. What is the role of your department in the program of liberal education for all students, majors or otherwise?

5. If your department performs the task of preparing students for an occupation or profession, what occupations or professions are your majors qualified to enter upon graduation, without further academic training? If possible, can you comment on the relative success of your graduates as compared to those of institutions which devote more time to "narrower" vocational training? To those from institutions offering less specialized training than ours?

6. Is the present general education program consonant with your view of the objectives of education? Explain. In any case, how would you define its present objectives?

7. In your opinion, are other departments providing for your majors the proper kind of general education? The proper service courses? If the funds were available, where would you expand and develop your offerings? For what purpose?

C. Techniques

1. Is there sufficient coordination and collaboration between your department and others in curricular matters? Specifically, are there unexplored opportunities for joint courses or course sequences? Is there too much overlapping at present between courses you offer and those of other departments? Betwen some of your courses and material covered in high school courses? If this is a problem, how should it be remedied?

2. What are the differences between 200,300,400, etc. courses in your department? Is there any developmental relationship between these courses? Should some be given at different levels?

3. On educational grounds, what are the relative merits for Rutgers of lecture-quiz section system? Small individual sections? Preceptorials? Which are being employed at present?

4. Can more be done to utilize the manpower and resources of the state and region for lectures, demonstrations, etc. (e.g. the honorary professorships in the biological fields.)

5. Do you favor a common curriculum for all or part of the work of the freshman and sophomore years? Do you favor satisfactory performance on a comprehensive examination as a pre-requisite to upper-class work? Explain. Are there other schemes of selecting students for upper-class work which you think would be more desirable.

6. In your field what further can be done to facilitate the transfer from secondary school to college for students whose preparation is deficient? If applicable, comment on the value and the problems of remedial courses.

D. Personnel

1. Do prevailing methods of faculty recruitment give the College a staff capable of conducting liberal education as effectively as possible? Can you suggest possible improvements?

2. Does the present curricular set-up and teaching schedule permit your department to hire the type of teacher-scholar most desired? Comment.

3. What does your department consider to be the relationship of productive scholarship to effective supervision of liberal education?

E. The Basic Course(s) and General Education Requirements

1. What qualities and abilities are you trying to develop in the student who takes your basic course?

2. Is this course a "survey" course which attempts to cover most of the major aspects of the particular discipline, or is it restricted to certain areas or problems that can be explored more deeply. What are the relative merits of the above approaches?

3. Is there any distinction made in the basic courses between those going on in the field and the general Arts and Sciences -- or other -- students?

4. Are you able to offer sufficient challenge to the superior students in your basic courses? What methods do you use?

5. Do you think it would serve a useful, practical purpose to establish closer liaison between instructors teaching the basic course in the various Soci Social Sciences? Humanities? Sciences? What would such a liaison group do?

6. At present, all students take two courses in each division to satisfy the general education requirements. Alternatives employed in other institutions include

(a) A general introduction to each of the divisional fields, i.e., Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, over two years in which representatives from all the relevant disciplines in each field participate.

(b) Election of a more varied program, i.e. for each field, four semester courses from the various disciplines in the field.

(c) A one-year general introduction to each field with choice for each division of one specialized departmental course for the second year.

(d) Other combinations of the above.

Which of the above, including our own system, do you consider the most satisfactory for our purposes at Rutgers, and why?

7. Which department members teach the basic courses? Senior? Junior? Graduate assistants? All? What do you consider the ideal distribution of staff for the basic courses, in terms of rank and experience?

8. If the basic course were dropped, what effect would it have on remaining work in the department?

9. In your basic course(s) is there any written work required of your students other than the writing of examinations?

10. In what way is the inability of students to use the English language reflected in their performance in the courses in your field? Do you attempt in any way to help develop the student's ability in the use of the English language? Do you have any suggestions for improving student's ability to communicate clearly?

11. Do the students majoring in your field read many books which are not related to their classwork? Do the courses offered in your field expect the students to explore the library shelves for further knowledge?

12. Should every student have a functional command of a foreign language for purposes of comprehension, expression, reading and writing? If not, what, in your opinion, is the role of the foreign language requirement in the liberal arts curriculum?

13. Comment on the relative value of types of language requirement such as:

(1) a proficiency test;

(2) a course level attainment (e.g., every student should complete 202);

(3) a requirement of a specified number of college semesters in the language, irrespective of the high-school background.

14. Apart from any general language requirement for graduation what knowledge of foreign languages should be specifically required of students in your field — dictionary acquaintance, technical reading knowledge, fluent literary reading, or understanding of the spoken language?

15. What specific languages are required or recommended in your field (a) for students not going beyond the A.B., or (b) for those planning advanced study? In the upperclass years, is any reading assigned, or suggested, in a foreign language? If not, do you believe this could be done with profit?

16. What, in your opinion, should be the role of a Freshman mathematics course in a liberal arts curriculum?

APPENDIX II May 4, 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR DIVISIONAL MEETINGS

The Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts & Sciences has been assigned two intimately related tasks. The first is to aid the faculty in making a self-evaluation of our present program of liberal education. The second is to propose curriculum changes if these seem desirable.

SELF-EVALUATION

The Departments' answers to the questionnaire and meetings with the departmental representatives, together with other information the committee has gathered, have been helpful in the task of self-evaluation. On the basis of its studies the committee finds there is a significant weight of faculty opinion which feels that there are deficiencies or need for correction in certain areas. For your information and in the most general terms these are:

1) Orientation of freshmen, academic advising of all students, and general student faculty relations.

2) Performance of our students in reading, writing and speaking.

3) The problem of encouraging and assisting good teaching.

4) The current state of physical facilities and the relation of these facilities to effective education.

5) Concern with general intellectual climate or morale of the university community.

6) Relations with secondary schools - generally a concern with the state of communications between schools and the college and the fact that neither particularly appreciates the problems and the purposes of the other.

7) The need to combat the intellectual isolationism and provincialism which many believe to be characteristic of Rutgers students.

The above are merely suggestions of general areas which the committee is in the process of exploring more thoroughly.

CURRICULUM POSSIBILITIES

On the whole, the evidence is clear that the College of Arts & Sciences does an excellent job in preparing students in particular fields - a virtue that must be maintained with the utmost tenacity. There is very much less evidence for the conclusion that we are doing a similarly good job in general, liberal education for all students. At other institutions which have considered their programs in recent years - examples are Harvard, Yale, Princeton, NYU, Chicago, Wisconsin, Amherst, Florida, Michigan State - certain weaknesses of a system such as ours have been almost unanimously noted. In the broadest terms and using the phraseology of these other institutions to help avoid our own possible preconceptions, these weaknesses appear to lie in some of the following characteristics:

1) Our student body has very little in the way of commonly shared intellectual experiences.

2) The pattern of general education is so loose as to reflect little education-

al purpose - certainly it does not serve as a series of points of reference to give fuller meaning to all the specific courses the student takes. It tends to be too much of a device for counting course credits.

3) As a result, the significance which students find in their educational experience tends to be almost exclusively in terms of professional and vocational aims.

4) The almost random selection of particular courses, outside the major and related fields, tends in many cases to limit the student's possibility of seeing interrelationships and the overall social and personal significance of his various courses.

5) No systematic approach is provided to the interpretation of life today in its meaningful relationship to life in early periods of the world's history.

It is for these reasons, in part, that the Committee is exploring possible means of overcoming these weaknesses.

The proposals listed below, it should be emphasized, are neither a fully worked-out program of liberal education nor an immutable set of rigid specifications. They are merely suggestions for discussion. They reflect, in the opinion of the Committee, the direction indicated by faculty (and student) comments (and complaints) and by the experience of virtually every first-rate institution whose recent educational experiments we have studied.

1) ENGLISH, WRITING, READING AND SPEAKING.

All students will be required to take a one-year course in which they will read certain selected texts and in which they will write papers based upon their reading. Thus, the reading and the writing will go hand in hand and the students will have the experience of basing their writing upon the substantial content of and with the guidance provided by good examples. It is contemplated that each section be limited to a small number of students, preferably not more than ten, in order that opportunity be provided for careful discussion of ideas and techniques found in the materials read. Also, small sections will enable the instructor carefully to supervise the student's work. At the same time students meeting in small groups will be able to present their work orally before the group, and all students will have an opportunity to criticize each other's work.

In order to achieve a carry-over from this course into the rest of the student's work, it is proposed that in the three general examinations listed below, the quality of the student's expression be evaluated together with his knowledge of particular subject matter.

2) FOREIGN LANGUAGE.

All students will be required to pass an examination which will test their knowledge in one foreign language. This examination should be based on the equivalent of the satisfactory completion of the two-year program in the particular language. For those students who can pass the examination without previous work, one year in the work of the literature of the language will be sufficient to meet the language requirement. This would give an additional incentive for top performance on the examination.

3) SOCIAL STUDIES.

All students will be required to pass a general examination in this field. This examination will consist of two parts: the first part will cover the student's knowledge of the dynamics of contemporary society, while in the second part, the student will have an option of taking his examination over the work of one of the particular departments in this division.

No specific course will be required of all students before they are able to take this examination. In order to aid the students in preparing for this examination it is recommended that the division offer an integrated course in which the various departments cooperate. Normally, a student then would take this integrated course plus a course in either Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, or Geography as preparation for his general examination. Note that History is not included in this group since work in this field will be covered by another general examination listed below.

A student who is a major in this field normally would not take the integrated course since it is expected that sometime during his academic career he would take a sufficient number of courses in each of these disciplines to be able to pass the general examination.

The committee is in no position to make detailed recommendations as to the content of the integrated course although it has the feeling that this ought not be merely a survey of the various disciplines. The planning of such a course would necessitate the expenditure of a great deal of effort on the part of the individual departments concerned. It is contemplated that individual members of the participating departments be given sufficient time off from their normal academic duties for a period of a year or more to plan the content of such a course. This proposal would hold for #4 and #5 below as well.

4) HERITAGE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION (HISTORY, LITERATURE, CLASSICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION).

All students will be required to pass a general examination in this field. This examination will consist of two parts: the first will cover the student's knowledge of some of the bases and traditions of western civilization; the second will be in one of the fields of this division. As in #3 above, it is recommended that an integrated course, centered about two or three of the fields listed, be prepared to aid the students preparing for this examination. Similarly, a major in one of these departments would normally not take the integrated course, for the same reason as listed above.

5) SCIENCE.

All students will be required to take a general examination in science. An option should be provided, the suggested division being into the physical sciences, i.e., physics and chemistry, on the one hand, and the biological and earth sciences on the other. A student should be required to take only one of these general examinations.

As preparation for these examinations, it is suggested that the respective departments might prepare two integrated courses. Each of these ought to be three-semester courses. It is clear that some students might prefer to prepare by taking two one-year courses in the fields of the general examination rather than the three-semester integrated course. This would be of some advantage, since on the one hand it would prevent the general examination from being simply a final examination for the integrated course, and on the other it would ensure that the departmental courses will give some attention to the interdisciplinary relationships which should be part of the experience of all students taking science.

6) MATHEMATICS.

In each of the three general examinations, Social Studies, the Heritage of Western Civilization and the Sciences, there should be a section devoted to some aspect of mathematics. A student will take the mathematics section in the division of his major interest.

This scheme recognizes the existing situation in which there is a considerable variety of courses offered to help satisfy the present mathematics-science requirement. A possible deficiency of the present system is that there may be insufficient correlation between the student's work in mathematics and his broad general area of concentration. Under the proposed plan a student in the sciences could start his necessary mathematics preparation early and in the areas most significant for his future work. Similarly, a student in the other two divisions could be prepared in those areas of mathematics most relevant to his major interests.

As in the other fields a student would not be required to take any particular mathematics course to prepare for the general examinations. It goes without saying that specific departments may require such mathematics as necessary for their majors.

The Committee feels, however, that for those students who wish to take work in mathematics as preparation for their examination, certain one-year courses should be devised by the mathematics department as aids in preparation. These courses need not be mere "tool" courses but should include the contribution of mathematics to the other disciplines. The course designed to aid students in the preparation for the cultural heritage examination might stress the role of mathematics as a language with perhaps some attention to the study of symbolic logic. The course designed for science and social science students might deal with the application of mathematical notions to problems in these fields.

The mathematics sections of each of the general exams should be devised with the aid of the mathematics department and the other departments in each of the fields. The close collaboration of the departments in this task might aid in the defining of the goals of mathematics preparation.

7) FINE ARTS.

All students will be required to take a one-year course in either art, music, or perhaps drama. The departments involved might be encouraged to experiment by giving the student some actual participation in work of the field as well as introducing him to its historical and literary aspects.

NOTES: 1) The above program is designed to provide some measure of common shared experience in at least the basic fields of knowledge followed by the College. At the same time, it permits the student to enter upon his field of specialization early (with enough flexibility so that he may change with a minimum loss of time).

2) As compared with the present general education requirements, it adds at the most one and one-half possible courses to the total general requirements. Even that may in part be made up by exceptional proficiency in foreign languages or by preparation for the general examination in the field of the major. Thus, there is nothing here to prevent a department from making certain requirements to meet the needs of its majors.

3) The preparation for the three general examinations (#3,#4,#5) can be so staggered that each student takes one such examination in each of the three years beyond the freshman level. Suggested patterns for science majors, humanities majors, social studies majors can be relatively easily worked out.

4) The suggested program leaves approximately the same scope for electives as the present system. It has the merit of preserving the strengths of our present organization, while adding, in three broad fields, the values of close correlation or related materials which have been urged by a considerable part of the faculty and which the Committee feels have been unduly neglected.

5) The Committee makes no pretense of being able to work out the proper "integrated" courses proposed. This is a long-run task to which the relevant departments should address themselves, with time provided for the job.

APPENDIX III

SPECIAL REPORT ON THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

I. Why require foreign language study for graduation?

1. Faculty opinion: No department has recommended to the Committee that a foreign language requirement be dropped. Departments, with varying degrees of emphasis, have listed knowledge of at least one language other than English among the skills thought requisite in a college graduate. The monolingual isolationism of the American has been thought contributory to that provincial narrowness and intolerance which several departments feel it is the chief task of the College to break down. It is of significance that no set of abilities is more often or more emphatically listed by departments (and with most emphasis of all by Personnel and Placement!) than those of oral and written communication. That foreign language study has a direct bearing on the development of skills along these lines is evident upon a slight reflection. "Concern for style," we are told, "must pervade a whole system of education." (General Education in School and College.) There is further confirmation of this in a detail of a report from Cornell, where departments were asked what their departmental foreign language requirements would be if the college requirements were dropped. The highest proposed, 18 hours in one language, was submitted by the Department of Speech and Drama.

2. The practice of other colleges: The sub-committee sees no reason why Rutgers should not stand alone or assume the lead in a defensible course. The fact is, however, that a foreign language requirement for graduation is standard practice among institutions of a status comparable to ours. For illustration, the following institutions, chosen almost at random, have such a requirement: Bucknell, Colgate, Columbia, Cornell, Delaware, Harvard, Lafayette, Lehigh, Maryland, Nebraska, Ohio State, Pennsylvania, Penn State, Princeton, Temple, Yale.

The Modern Language Association is preparing a report on foreign language instruction in colleges and universities which is promised for the fall of 1953. Meanwhile, the following list of colleges requiring two or more years of foreign language for graduation has been sent to the sub-committee. Figures in parentheses indicate semester hours required by each. University of Arizona (16); Boston University (18); University of California (16); City College, N.Y.C. (12); Colgate University, N.Y. (12); University of Connecticut (18); Cornell University, N.Y. (15); De Paul University, Ill. (12); De Pauw University, Ind. (16); Duke University, N.C. (12); Franklin and Marshall College (12); Hamilton College, N.Y. (18); Indiana University (18); Lehigh University, Pa. (12); Manhattan College, N.Y.C.(18); University of Maine (14); University of Mississippi (18); University of Nebraska (18); University of North Dakota (18); University of Pennsylvania (12); Queens College, N.Y. (12); University of South Carolina (18); Stanford University (18); Swarthmore College, Pa. (12); University of Tennessee (27 quarter hr.); Tulane University (18); Ursinus College, Pa. (16); University of Virginia (18-24); Wesleyan University, Conn. (12); University of Wisconsin (24-30); College of William and Mary (12-18).

3. Relevant educational trends: The United States is in a position where it must make new friends and hold old ones all over the world, and our very security requires that we be able to know, analyze and assess what our enemies actual and potential are thinking, saying and planning. This means that the United States needs desperately and will continue to need a large body of native sons and daughters equipped with a functional command of at least one modern foreign tongue and the ability to think beyond familiar, inbred patterns. Recognition of these needs has led an organ of the NEA, the 8th National Conference on Higher Education, with 364 accredited colleges and universities represented, to resolve to recommend that increasing provision be made for the study and effective teaching of foreign languages and cultures at all levels of American education —

elementary, secondary, higher. The U.S. Commissioner of Education has in the past year assumed the role of leader in the same direction. A full-scale effort by the MLA toward the same ends is well underway. Full development of such announced trends will require more language teachers, and teachers to teach the teachers. Meantime, an opposite trend has been affecting the secondary schools: The invasion of the standard curriculum by the life-adjustment concept, and the dropping of language offerings in N.J. high schools to a typical maximum of only two years (and those unfortunately the first two) in a given language. Caught then between a present low-level of language effort in secondary schools, and a possibly imminent expansion of language effort at all levels, the College would seem to have a clear duty to give the best language instruction it can to the most students.

4. Contributions of language study to liberal education. Ancient, Renaissance and modern educational theory are in agreement on at least one point, that the goal of education is some form of self-realization in the learner, some new awareness, some rounding out of the hitherto unfulfilled. The joy (the word is not too strong for the Rutgers undergraduate when he is given the chance) of realizing a new potentiality, of discovering a new mode of thought and expression and a new area of awareness, is no doubt the chief contribution of language study to the liberal education of the undergraduate.

A second contribution is the building of attitudes through access to the beauty and wisdom to be found in literature. The spiritual qualities which separate man's aspirations from those of the brutes have not always been recorded in English. Careful study of great masters, and the tracing, through literary history, of the slowly won concepts of human freedom and conscience, constitute a humanizing process, and incidentally the best antidote to the totalitarian view of the individual.

Foreign language study and its related materials can, and almost invariably do, enhance the learner's capacity to appreciate and enjoy music and the arts. For example, many new, and many other better-informed listeners to opera have been created in language classrooms through the study and assimilation of operatic texts and their literary background.

Foreign language study contributes in various ways to that most fully-agreed desideratum, better English. Here the student meets formal grammatical discipline (for the first time, according to some of the reports received by the Committee). He gains perspective on his own tongue by meeting grammatical concepts at the level of abstraction, this too not uncommonly for the first time, since he can in part play English by ear. His vocabulary is increased through the exercise of precise translation and through acquaintance with roots and loan-words. He is required to use daily and hence develop the skills of oral and written communication. He has some opportunity to become interested in the processes of philology and comparative linguistics. Finally, a point not always justly emphasized, he learns to listen, one of the most fruitful and least spontaneous of language skills.

Foreign language study, by opening up a new civilization to the student's awareness, contributes to his usefulness as a citizen and to his broadness as a human being. It is a step toward the comparative viewpoint. It makes him a more perceptive reader of the daily newspaper. It makes him a more understanding traveler, a potential good-will ambassador, a more skilled and valuable soldier in time of war. He is led toward greater tolerance and more ready sympathy. He learns to see Coca Cola and the Brooklyn Dodgers in their proper perspective. He gains a more accurate because more critical appreciation of American civilization. One cannot love America best who knows only America.

Foreign language is a necessary tool for any serious research, and a standard requirement of graduate schools for advanced degrees.

Foreign language is a useful auxiliary in such occupations as medicine, pharmacy, library science, teaching, journalism, missionary work, field research, advanced study and practice of the fine arts.

Foreign language mastery is indispensable to such vocations as export-import, foreign sales, travel agencies, international banking, international news service, certain radio work, diplomatic and consular service, interpreting and translating, and various specialized defense services.

II. Foreign language proficiency Defined.

A language is a medium of spoken and written communication. We have functional command of a language (absolute command of whatever language being given to no man) when we can readily receive the thoughts of another when spoken normally in that language; when we can express effectively our own thoughts in it to another person; when we can read the written or printed page in it at reasonable speed and without undue recourse to the dictionary; and when we can transfer the spoken word into writing.

Proficiency in a foreign language means the ability to do substantially these things; in a sufficient frame of reference.

III. Why define language proficiency in this manner?

Members of the language teaching profession who do not themselves have the type of proficiency indicated above are wont to insist rather on whatever it is that they do have. It seems obvious that a language which is not a medium of two-way communication in the manner described in Section II above is not a language at all in any meaningful sense of the term. Examination of the contributions which foreign language study can make to the liberal education of an individual (See Section I, Par. 4 above) reveals that in nearly every case the contribution depends upon the rounded concept of proficiency which is here presented. To give less when it is possible to give this would seem clearly to be an evasion of duty.

There is no evidence known to the writers of the present report which proves or even tends to prove that substantial achievement of these rounded goals is impossible *when a good try is actually made*. The experience of properly qualified teachers in this College over the past quarter of a century would on the whole bear out the present contention.

Comment is called for on the goal of foreign language study for reading proficiency only. This is indeed the aspect most heavily stressed by the Faculty in its communications to the Committee. It is the goal whose achievement is easiest and surest, and whose long-run practical application is most nearly certain under ordinary circumstances. With respect to one of the contributions listed in Section I, Par. 4 above, namely that of a research tool, the reading goal may be described as adequate. A misconception may easily occur when one comes to consider reading proficiency in its application to the reading of literature. If by *reading* we mean what we say, and not *translation*, it is evident that reading ability in this sense needs to be based on oral-aural proficiency of the full type, as it is, for example, when we read English. Furthermore, if we approach the treasures of a foreign literature in search of beauty as well as wisdom, we must recognize that without oral-aural groundwork there can be no awareness of style, no openness to the flavor of speech and its contribution to characterization, no sensing of rhythm, musicality, balance, accent, sound harmonies and other subvocal features of style, and therefore no intuitive perception of the living spirit of a work. Any attempt to separate true reading from its oral-aural basis is thus essentially artificial.

There is abundant evidence (a random example is a study made at Cornell and described in *Modern Language Journal*, December, 1950) that heavy stress on oral-aural aspects of language enables the student to achieve reading proficiency twice as rapidly and better than where the stress is reversed. It is natural and logical for reading proficiency to follow oral-aural proficiency and increase with it. The reverse is not natural or logical, and in fact rarely occurs.

IV. Foreign language instruction.

Achievement to a meaningful degree of the kind of foreign language proficiency herein referred to depends directly and utterly on the quality of instruction. This means that there must be sections of manageable size. An unfavorable trend at Rutgers which needs to be watched may be seen in the forced abandonment of the traditional norm of 15 students per section in favor of a debatable 25, and then even of the latter. The success of the program requires also a suitable system of placement, which shall guarantee to each student the pressure requisite to learning, but freedom from over-strain and demoralization. Above,all, the success of the program requires recognition of the paramount importance of effective teaching.

If the knowledge and pedagogical skill of the teacher are central to all phases of liberal education, this is unusually true of language work. Nothing is less readily self-taught than foreign language proficiency, and two-way communication requires two ways. Now, there is a possible relationship between the linguistic and pedagogical skills which can impart true proficiency and the well-known academic formula of doctorate-cum-annual publication, but there is no necessary relationship between them, and not to recognize this is simply to fly in the fact of the facts. Indeed, given the curriculum and atmosphere of the prevalent type of American graduate school, there is real danger that the relationship will be a negative one. We need to close and not widen the gap which has come about between training and function in the foreign language field. Some, though not of course undue, allowance needs to be made in matters of promotion and tenure for the atypical teacher in this field.

Notably for the foreigner teaching his native tongue, who needs to be represented in any well-balanced language staff, and on whose neck the imposition of the American Ph. D. millstone is an act of stupid and needless cruelty. So also for the American who, through training and experience acquired almost certainly outside of graduate school, is able to make the language classroom a living and vivid experience, and thus lead his students to true competence as well as to further study. Indeed, the question may be raised at this point whether the bibliography of a man's students may not be a better indication of his power as a teacher than his own.

Clarence E. Turner
Romigio U. Pane

APPENDIX IV

REPORT OF THE AREA PROGRAM COMMITTEE
of
THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The Area Program Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences, a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee of that College, was established under a memorandum of February 2, 1953, from the Dean of the College (see Enclosure #1). Under that memorandum the Committee was directed "to study the possibility of furthering the area program curriculum in the College and to evaluate our present programs." Eight members of the faculty of the College were appointed to the Committee: These were: P. Charanis, R. Alexander, B. Baker, D. Blumenstock, D. Denker, A. Kellogg, P. Massing, and R. Pane.

The Committee held its first meeting on February 19, 1953. During this meeting, which was attended by Mr. Henry Winkler, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee, the Area Program Committee selected Mr. Peter Charanis as its Chairman and outlined the topics to be considered in subsequent meetings.

The Committee met seven times in all during the period February 19, through May 19. As a result of these meetings certain general conclusions were reached and four specific resolutions were passed. These conclusions and resolutions are set forth below.

In the performance of its assigned tasks, the Committee reviewed not only the existing area programs within this University, but also, in a general way, the status of such programs at other universities. The principal findings and conclusions of the Committee are listed below. However, a minority report addressed to the final sentence of the paragraph which begins on page 3, is appended.

1. Except in the field of American Civilization, where undergraduate

area studies unaccompanied by graduate work are common, virtually all area programs at other universities are either solely graduate programs or undergraduate and graduate programs combined. From this interdependence of graduate and undergraduate area programs in other universities, the Committee concluded that the development of graduate programs in conjunction with the present undergraduate area programs is at least highly desirable and probably indispensable.

2. To be successful, an area program must be supported by a strong staff centered about one or two outstanding scholars in the appropriate cultural field and including a staff which can contribute to the program the knowledge of several different disciplines.

3. No area program can be presented successfully without extensive teaching of the principal languages spoken in the area.

4. The existing area programs must be strengthened through making available those courses in anthropology and sociology which will be particularly appropriate to the programs.

5. A successful area program must be supported by adequate library resources.

6. On the basis of the experience of other universities, it is concluded that more is accomplished through concentrating on two or three area programs than through the attempted presentation of a larger number of such programs. The number of programs a university can successfully support depends upon the funds which can be devoted to this purpose. Hence, only a very few of the wealthiest universities have been able successfully to maintain area programs in more than three fields.

7. At the undergraduate level, area programs are commonly presented on an interdepartmental basis with perhaps a small independent faculty group

administering the program under the guidance of a committee and presenting a few fundamental comprehensive courses. At the graduate level, it is common to have a strong independent faculty group which administers the program, provides a variety of courses, and draws subsidiary support from courses presented in the various departments of the University. From these and other considerations, it is concluded that at Rutgers the present system, whereby these programs are organized chiefly on an interdepartmental basis, is satisfactory.

The Committee unanimously passed four resolutions which are quoted below as formally approved. In brief, these resolutions call for a continuation of three area programs now offered in the fields of American Civilization, Russia, and Latin America; a continuation of the present policy under which the present area programs rest in large part upon courses offered by various established departments of the College; a strengthening of the language offerings in support of the Russian and Latin American programs; a building up of library resources in support of the three programs; the review and strengthening where possible of courses now offered in support of the various programs; obtaining or assigning to the Russian Area Program a scholar who takes as his field some principal aspect of Russian civilization; and the extension within the next few years of the Russian and Latin American programs to the graduate level. In its formal resolution concerning possible establishment of other area programs, as for example, a Far East area program, the Committee recommends that the establishment of any additional programs be delayed until the area programs presently being offered have been markedly strengthened, and until sufficient support is forthcoming to establish any new program on a sound and comprehensive basis which will provide for the teaching of the necessary languages, the provision of adequate library resources

sources, and the assignment to the program of scholars who take as their principal field of interest the area concerned.

The four resolutions of the Committee as formally passed are as follows:

1. RESOLVED, that the American Civilization Program be continued in its present form under which the coordinating courses, American Civilization 201-202 and 401-402 continue to be given and under which also the program will continue to rest in large part on offerings from the accepted disciplines. Be it further resolved that for the purpose of strengthening the American Civilization Program that membership of the committee administering the program be broadened to include representatives of the various participating departments; and that this committee review the entire program for the purposes of

a. developing a policy relating to the support of the program by the various departments;

b. resolving the administrative problems arising from the simultaneous participation within one program of two groups; one entrusted with the formal administration of the program, and the other associated solely with established departments; and

c. considering any other problems which may arise in the administration of the program.

2. RESOLVED, that the Latin American Civilization Program continue to be offered on an inter-departmental basis as at the present time, and that this program be strengthened with the objective of activating a graduate program in this field within the next few years.

It is further RESOLVED that to strengthen the undergraduate Latin American Civilization Program, and to provide a basis for a future graduate program, the following specific steps be taken:

a. Establish a broadly representative committee to administer the program and to review its requirements with a view to strengthening it by the

a. inclusion of Portuguese.

b. Extend the teaching of Portuguese to include at least four years.

c. Review and strengthen where necessary the courses presently offered in various departments in support of the Latin American Program.

d. Strengthen the library's Latin American collection.

3. RESOLVED, that the Russian Area Program continue, as at the present time, to be offered on an interdepartmental basis. Be it RESOLVED further that, with the view to (a) strengthening the existing program and (b) activating a graduate program, the following measures, essential to the success of both graduate and undergraduate programs, be taken:

(1) Extend the teaching of Slavic languages to include at least four years of Russian and, if possible, courses in Slavic languages other than Russian.

(2) Obtain or assign to the program a scholar who takes as his field some principal aspect of Russian civilization.

(3) Review and strengthen where necessary the courses presently offered in various departments in support of the Russian Area Program.

(4) Build up markedly the library resources in the Slavic field so as to have available a moderate-sized but well-balanced collection of library materials in history, institutions, geography, literature, philosophy, and philology.

4. RESOLVED, that no additional area programs be inaugurated by the College until (1) the existing area programs have been built up and strengthened as recommended above, and (2) sufficient support is forthcoming to provide for the teaching of relevant languages, the building up of library resources, and the obtaining or assignment of the necessary scholars in support of the new program.

5. The Committee wishes to emphasize at the risk of repetition that undergraduate area programs are interdepartmental programs and should be administered as such. They do not and should not constitute independent and separate departments by themselves, for such programs are not disciplines in themselves but convenient arrangements whereby the civilization of an area as a whole may be studied.

B. Baker
R. Alexander
D. Blumenstock
P. Massing
A. Kellogg
P. Pane
D. Denker
P. Charanis, Chairman

The Minority Report Addressed to the Final Sentence of Paragraph Which Begins on Page 3

The undersigned desire to express their views on the educational implications contained in the final sentence of the paragraph which begins on page 3 of the general report of the Committee which begins with, "In its formal resolution concerning possible establishment" and ends with "who take as their principal field of interest the area concerned."

We are fully in accord with the premise that area programs have merit. We believe, however, that proper administration of these programs require, as the Committee unanimously decided, a relatively few core courses with the major emphasis on offerings given by existing departments. Our view is based on two premises: (1) An area program is not a separate discipline, but a convenient arrangement whereby the civilization of an area as a whole may be studied; (2) this civilization can be most competently presented by a number of men, each a master of a specific discipline and offering courses in this discipline. Civilization is too many-sided and facted to be mastered by any one single individual. We do not believe that there is a "civilizationist" in the sense that there is a historian or a linguist, though both the historian or the linguist may be very broad in their interests. Were we to assume that we could engage "civilizationists" to teach our area programs, there is real danger, we think, of these programs becoming superficial and even doctrinaire in their approach.

For these reasons we believe that the sentence of the general report of the Committee referred to in the first paragraph of this — the minority — report should be amended to read: "and the assignment to the program of scholars who take as their principal field of interest specific disciplines in the area concerned."

We would also like to comment on paragraph numbered "2" which appears on page 2 of the report of the whole Committee. We confess we have some difficulty understanding what this paragraph means. It should mean, as we interpret it, that an area program must be supported by a strong staff each member of which has as his interest some specific discipline and that this staff should include one or two outstanding scholars specifically concerned with some discipline relating to the area of the program. If this indeed is the meaning of the paragraph, then we agree with it. But if the paragraph is intended to mean something else, especially if that something else is not in harmony with the statement unanimously accepted by the Committee, that area "programs are not disciplines in themselves but convenient arrangements whereby the civilization of an area as a whole may be studied," then we do not agree with it.

Respectfully submitted,
Benjamin Baker
Peter Charanis